

Vol. XII

EAST

ST

17

1. Name of the
person or
institution

John A. Brown
Washington, D.C.

2. Address

Washington, D.C.

3. City

Washington, D.C.

4. State

Library

5. Country

Library

6. Date

May 15, 1944

7. Subject

St. Mary's College

8. Remarks

Value: 120 dollars

9. Signature

Billings and expenses

10. Date

as entered into an
exact Census Survey
available in libraries

11. Date

of the census year
and is furnished in
the following form

THE EASTERN CHURCHES QUARTERLY

(Continuation of *Eastern Churches Number of 'Pax'*,
founded 1931)

VOL. XIV

SPRING 1961

No. I

EDITORIAL

THE rapid changes to which we are constantly obliged to adapt ourselves in so many aspects of our secular lives may perhaps have had a dulling effect on our realisation of the almost miraculous evolution that is now taking place in the relations between the great Christian communities. We have for centuries been accustomed to think of division as inevitable and almost normal, and in doing so have all too seldom got beyond an attitude of self-satisfaction in regard to our own position and of contempt or at best patronising sympathy in regard to that of others.

Since the election of the See of Peter of Pope John XXIII and the announcement of the calling of the Second Vatican Council, the engagement of the Catholic Church herself in this evolution, though not unprepared during the previous pontificates, must have seemed to many to be almost dramatic in its swiftness. The Council in particular, with the emphasis placed by the Pope in this connection on internal reform, adaptation to the needs of the present day (not least in regard to relationships with other Christians), and on constructive self-criticism of all kinds within the Church, has seemed to many non-Catholics to take away one of the major obstacles which existed on the Catholic side: the apparent refusal of the Church to have any part in saying *mea culpa*.

No doubt there are many things which the Church of her very nature cannot 'reform'; many responsibilities which she must continue to place on the shoulders of those who dissent

from her. But it is also true that what cannot be renounced can be reinterpreted and explained anew, for it is characteristic of the mysteries of divine revelation that as they are infinitely unknowable, so also they are infinitely knowable. It would be unreasonable for our brethren to expect the Church to go back on her past dogmatic formulations: the 'fellowship with the Church of all the ages' must be maintained at all costs. But there is nothing to prevent her from making any number of new formulations of the same truths, by means of which they may become more effectually a 'mystery of salvation' for all.

In all this, the need has never been more urgent for clear, positive and irenic theological reflection upon the Church's traditional doctrinal inheritance. Only so can the Holy Spirit sift the grain from the chaff, help us to distinguish the Church's dogmatic faith from mere human theological embroidery. We are therefore glad to be able to offer *Fr Dejaisve's* article on the relationship between the Papal Primacy and the apostolic authority of the Bishops. To make it easier to read, we have collected the footnotes—which will be indispensable to the theologian—at the end of the article. It is an article which has already been translated into other languages and widely disseminated, so that it is in itself a significant document in the context of the Church's preparation for the Council.

FIRST AMONG THE BISHOPS

THE coming Second Vatican Council has been expressly called with the intention of preparing the way for the unity of all Christians. If it is to remain faithful to this intention, there is one question above all others which it cannot avoid being concerned with in one way or another: that of the meaning of the doctrine of the Primacy of the Pope. One does not need to have a very profound acquaintance with the mentality of Christians who are separated from Rome to be aware that it is in the 'Vatican dogma' that is to be found the foremost and basic obstacle to any closer unity of hearts and minds, unity which is indispensable if we are to go further on the road towards visible communion. There are

no doubt some Catholics who would maintain, with the serene complacency of a confessional 'good conscience', that this opposition which exists to the authority of Peter's successor is due to prejudice; of a kind which, perhaps, may never be overcome. They are entitled to their opinion. But we are obliged at all events to recognise that this conviction of our separated brethren is profound, motivated, and deeply sincere in terms of the particular religious traditions to which they belong.¹

May we not, however, rather admit that in the abrupt, incomplete and deliberately categorical form in which they were defined at the Vatican Council, the dogmas of the pontifical Primacy and Infallibility could inevitably only provoke still further those who sincerely rejected the papal claims, and thus enlarge the gulf of separation?² This admission will appear less startling when we realize what a considerable number of Catholic bishops, not only among those of lesser reputation, had objections to the decree at the time, in its language if not in its content.³

'PETRA SCANDALI'

Whether we like it or not, the Primacy of the Pope does in fact present itself as a massive stone of stumbling on the way which ought to be leading all those Christians who are seriously concerned for unity towards closer union with Rome; and thus by a strange sort of irony the very basis of the Church's unity has become the principal cause of the schism among Christians.

We should not try to explain away this paradoxical situation too easily. It is comforting, but quite fruitless to say that, if Christ Himself was a cause of scandal during His earthly life, we may expect the same to be true in the case of His vicar. In order to maintain such a defence, we should need to be able to demonstrate that the scandal which exists is caused by the revealed truth itself, rather than by the imperfect and perhaps inappropriate manner in which we bear witness to it...

And it does in fact seem likely that a simplistic and unfortunately all too common presentation of this catholic truth is in this case responsible for the greater part of the misunderstanding. It is undeniable that a certain type of theological exposition, based exclusively on the letter of the conciliar decrees, has rendered it almost impossible for members of other confessions to attain to any profound understanding of the dogma. There are of course

many reasons which can be given for this 'incompleteness' of the work of the Council—the external political circumstances, the atmosphere of high emotional tension which reigned during the debates, the weariness which brought the Council to a premature end—all these things account in large measure for its imperfections and its omissions. It is not to be wondered at that Pope Pius IX, conscious of this state of affairs, declared the Council suspended but not closed. To-day it can perfectly well be declared closed, juridically speaking, but no one can by such means put an end to the debate which began at the Council with so much passion, nor can they declare solved questions which have still received no answer and which now more than ever provide food for theological speculation.

We may legitimately conclude, therefore, that the Fathers of the coming Second Vatican Council will not be able to avoid, under pain of failure in one of the principal objectives for which they have been called together, the reconsideration of a theme which has thus, as we have seen, been left half-finished: that of the pontifical prerogatives in their relation to the college of the bishops and to the hierarchical structure of the Church.

This task is all the more urgent, in that the Vatican definition of the papal privileges is as it stands 'top-heavy', and needs to be filled in, if it is to be properly understood, by insertion into the complete doctrinal structure in terms of which alone it can find its divinely intended balance and meaning. For the truths of faith are organic: like the cells of the body, they have their own living environment in which they are immersed. If they are violently separated from this environment, they run the risk of losing their identity and of their authentic meaning becoming obscured, with the result that the adhesion of faith, which they are supposed to illuminate and make more easy, becomes instead more difficult. There is thus from one Council to the next, especially when the mystery under consideration is the same, a progressive integration of the different aspects of revelation in an ever more comprehensive synthesis, which allows to each particular truth its respective place within the whole.

May we not therefore suppose that what took place between Ephesus and Chalcedon can also be repeated between the first and second Vatican Councils? It is all the more reasonable to expect this in view of the fact that one of the major themes of the first Vatican Council, the presentation of the mystery of the

Church in its harmonious unity, remained in the event at the project stage, and now in this 'ecumenical' age calls for realisation more than ever before.

It is thus perhaps not without value, during this period of preparation for the Council, to offer some reflections on this subject which are based upon the discussions of the Fathers of the Vatican Council themselves, and thus give a clearly authorised expression of the witness of the teaching Church. To examine their opinions with loyalty will be not merely to save from obscurity a significant part of the Church's tradition—in itself worthy of respect, for in it the Holy Spirit is still calling out to us—but also to throw considerable light from an authorised source on a debate which is still in progress, for despite the interval of a century, their problems are still our own.

THE VATICAN COUNCIL AND THE PRIMACY

The question of the Primacy, already latent in the discussions on the first projects 'De episcopis' and 'De sede episcopali vacante', was embarked on explicitly by the Fathers of the Council in the observations⁴ on Chapter XI of the presynodal schema 'De Ecclesiae constitutione'.

In reading attentively through these remarks, one is struck by the frequency with which one particular—and radical—criticism constantly recurs: that to define the Primacy of the Pope in isolation, without any mention of its essential connection with the collegiate apostolic office of the bishops, is not only to be guilty of a grave omission,⁵ resulting in a picture of the hierarchical structure of the Church which would be distorted because incomplete,⁶ but also to misrepresent the truth of the Primacy itself by obscuring it⁷ and rendering it unintelligible by severing it from its organic connection with its total doctrinal context.⁸

The Archbishop of Cologne, Mgr Melchers, summed up well the sentiments of a good number of the Fathers when he wrote, in his sober and rather brisk style: 'A statement is to be wished for about the bishops as successors of the Apostles, without which the true notion of the Primacy and its function in the hierarchical Church can neither be understood nor correctly expounded'.⁹

It was recognised by the members of the Deputation of the Faith—whose responsibility it was to evaluate the remarks of the Fathers on this Chapter, which was to be the basis of the new

Constitution on the Primacy and Infallibility—that these objections were well-founded. In regard to the omission concerning the authority of the bishops, the Commission replied that this aspect would be taken account of in the new Constitution, and that it would be treated at greater length in the second Constitution on the Church.¹⁰ In the event, this latter was never discussed, for lack of time. In regard to the first, which was in fact adopted by the Council (*Pastor aeternus*), it will be worth our while to give some attention to the successive revisions which it underwent, and which had the effect of modifying somewhat the all too evident disadvantages of a unilateral presentation of the papal prerogatives.

However, despite their promises, the authors of the new project failed, in the Preface to the new Constitution, to make any mention of the Apostles or of the bishops, speaking of Peter alone as the foundation stone of the Church.¹¹

In the first two amendments, Mgr Martinez of Havana and Mgr Thomas of La Rochelle drew attention to this, and the result was the publication, together with their observations, of an insertion to the conciliar text which was in conformity with their desires.¹² In his report, made in the name of the Deputation of the Faith, Mgr Leahy gave the following explanation: 'We have sought to give satisfaction, as far as possible, to the desiderata of the authors of these amendments by this addition in which the divine institution of the episcopate and its indivisible unity is clearly shown, together with the unity of all the pastors and of all the faithful in the bond of the Primacy of the Supreme Pontiff.'¹³

This addition is not without its importance, in that it brings out better the connection between the Primacy of Peter and of his successor, on the one hand, and the apostolic college which is continued in the episcopate on the other. The final text declares that Christ continues His mission through the Apostles, and that these latter, pastors and teachers of the flock, will endure to the end of time. This apostolic college is continued in the episcopate, which, however, composed as it is of a plurality of members who none the less form a single indivisible unity, needs to be bound together by some unifying principle if it is efficaciously to fulfil its own mission which is in turn to unite all the faithful in the bonds of a single faith and of a single communion. This principle of cohesion in the episcopal body is Peter, who was set forward by Christ Himself as a perpetual principle of unity and as a visible foundation of the temple of the Church.¹⁴

There are two points which are especially to be noted in these declarations about the meaning of the pontifical function :

- (i) the Primacy of Peter is precisely justified by the task of promoting and of guaranteeing the unity of the Church ;
- (ii) this Primacy is exercised in the first place in the heart of and in relation to an apostolic body whose unity of action it exists to ensure.

These two affirmations, which are explicit in the text, are moreover confirmed by the explanations given by the members of the Deputation of the Faith.

PRIMACY AND UNITY

There were a number of bishops who were dissatisfied with the term 'principium' as applied to Peter ; fearing a confusion between the position of Christ in the Church, and the function of the Pope, they proposed to substitute for it the expression 'centrum unitatis'.¹⁵

Mgr Leahy, the 'reporter' of the Deputation of the Faith, disposed of these fears by showing how Peter is as it were, on the level of an *instrument*, the visible and tangible means for efficaciously maintaining the unity in faith and communion of all the faithful who are dispersed throughout the world, and who differ from each other in so many ways.¹⁶ The word 'centre' on the other hand, did not indicate this unifying function sufficiently : its connotation is that of the relationship of the different members of a body of people to a point of co-ordination,¹⁷ whereas the unity which is realised by the Primacy of Peter is of a more essential and organic nature. The unity of the Church, in reality, is not the *result* of the coming together of the various members, but is anterior to them, for it is, in the last resort, the unity of Christ Himself which is communicated and attested by a visible and efficacious sign, the 'sacrament' of the Church's unity which is the person of Peter himself.

Unity is thus an essential attribute, intrinsic to the function of the Primacy ;¹⁸ and it is for this reason that Peter is called the 'principle' of unity. It is for the same reason that he possesses the fullness of pastoral authority, because his mission extends to the whole Church, and because it is through him that she is bound and submitted in bonds of faith and love to Christ, the sole and unique Pastor.

THE PRIMACY AND THE APOSTOLIC COLLEGE

Nevertheless, it is from the heart of the apostolic body that this unifying function is in the first place carried out, and it is normally speaking only by the mediation of this body that it attains the faithful. The declarations of the Preamble on this point seem to be as clear as could be wished for: '*In order that the episcopate might be one and undivided, and that by the intermediary of the bishops united intimately among themselves the multitude of the faithful might be preserved in unity, Peter was constituted as a visible head*'.¹⁹ This 'proximate reason' for the Primacy of Peter: the realisation of the unity of the apostolic body, is recalled in equivalent terms by Mgr D'Avanzo, the 'reporter' on the amendments to the two first Chapters of the Constitution.

In regard to the first Chapter, which treated of the institution of the Primacy in the person of Peter, and indicated the scriptural proofs for it, two of the Fathers, Mgr Moreno of Ivrea (Piedmont) and Cardinal Schwarzenberg of Prague, wondered why there was no mention made of the other Apostles to whom, after all, the texts quoted in favour of the Primacy applied equally. 'The proof of the Primacy of Peter from the text of Matt. 16, 18 would only be conclusive, said Mgr Schwarzenberg, if at the same time the relationship is explained which exists between Peter as foundation stone of the Church, and the other Apostles who are also its foundation stones, according to St Paul (Eph. 2), and who have received, just as Peter has, authority to bind and to loose (Matt. 18, 18).'²⁰

Mgr d'Avanzo, reporting on this Chapter for the Deputation of the Faith, replied to this difficulty with a quotation from Innocent III in his letter 'Apostolicae Sedis' to the Patriarch of Constantinople: 'what is said to Peter is addressed to him personally, to the exclusion of the others; what is said to the others is addressed to them in their unity with Peter. The consequence is that authority is given to him in such a way that it cannot be shared by the others without him, while on the other hand it belongs to him quite apart from the others, by virtue of the privilege which is conferred on him, and of the fullness of authority which is accorded to him.'²¹ Mgr d'Avanzo then went on at once to deal with the obvious objection which arises as soon as this affirmation is formulated, and to which we have already made allusion: 'is the authority which is given to Peter then absolute and without any limit?' The answer is in the negative, for his authority has a double

limit, which one may describe as being both 'active' and 'passive'. The limit is 'active' from the side of Christ, who confers this authority on Peter only in the measure of His own purpose and intention, not in order to destroy but in order to build up His body which is the Church. The 'passive' limitation to Peter's authority is likewise imposed by Christ Himself, in His very institution of the apostolic college. Like a skilful architect, Christ has set Peter as the foundation stone of the Church, but He has also Himself given Peter the builders with whom he is to work at the building-up of the Church; and these builders are the Apostles. Peter is constituted as a master who is to strengthen the others, but these others are none other than those whom Christ Himself has given to him as brethren in the apostolate and whom He Himself has thus chosen as His own brethren. And lastly, it is Peter who is commanded to feed the lambs; but these lambs are precisely those who are to be begotten by the sheep who are confided to Peter to be fed by him. Thus while it is true that it is in Peter that the full and supreme authority resides, he *cannot and even may not exercise it* through other auxiliaries than the Apostles and their successors.²²

Let us now summarise these precisions, which it is possible to regret were not inserted in the Chapter itself: Peter has received from Christ the fullness of apostolic authority, but he cannot and even may not exercise it by way of other auxiliaries than the collaborators whom he has been given, the other Apostles who have received the same pastoral mission over the whole of Christ's flock, in union with him and in dependence on him.

If this is indeed so, it is not difficult to understand the justification for the major objection which was addressed by the Fathers to the whole Constitution, and to which we have already drawn attention above: you cannot define the Primacy of the Pope without including the collegiate aspect of the apostolate through which it is exercised. This fact is no more than a reflection of the true relationship which exists between Peter and the apostolic College.

Mgr Schwarzenberg called attention to this once more, with tireless insistence, in his discourse of the 17th May: 'there is, moreover, a major difficulty, a veritable impossibility of defining the meaning of the Primacy without at the same time defining the authority of the Bishops. How is it possible to make a dogmatic statement about the centre, the apex, the supreme and chief pre-

siding authority, without considering at the same time the other members of the apostolic body, who also form part of the sacred hierarchy? The episcopate is a single organism: and a declaration which is made about any one of its parts inevitably has an immediate bearing upon the others; whatever is defined about the head, reflects upon the members as well. If Peter is pastor of both lambs and sheep, the bishops too are pastors. Peter both binds and looses, but both the one and the other are said too of the Apostles: we may suppose that there is some relation between the two . . . The jurisdiction of the Supreme Pontiff is described as being "ordinary and immediate"; how then is the 'ordinary and immediate' jurisdiction of the bishops to be reconciled with it?'²³

It is a matter of history that the Deputation of the Faith brushed these objections aside. Preoccupied with the various errors which were to be overcome, such as Gallicanism, Febronianism and Conciliarism, it was concerned primarily with the juridical aspect of the relationship between Pope and bishops,²⁴ and in this relationship, moreover, it envisaged only the aspect of the subjection of the latter to the former. It deliberately omitted consideration of the organic relationship which exists between the Primacy as it is actually exercised and the collegial authority of the bishops, who are successors of the Apostles and, as such, co-bearers of a universal apostolic mission. The Deputation did not, of course, deny this latter aspect; it even made a point of referring to it, as a result of the repeated insistence of the bishops, strongly conscious as they were of the universality of their pastoral mission, which was rendered all the more manifest by their presence at an ecumenical Council.

During the discussion on the third Chapter of the Constitution, in which there is a passing mention of the jurisdiction of the bishops over their respective flocks, two of the Fathers, among not a few others, Mgr Papp-Szilagyi, Roumanian-rite bishop of Hungary, and Mgr Guilbert of Gap, recalled that the bishops also, together with the Supreme Pontiff, have the responsibility of the solicitude of the whole Church, and that it would therefore be fitting to make mention of the fact.²⁵

Mgr Zinelli, in the name of the Deputation of the Faith, conceded this very readily: 'certainly the bishops, united with their head and representing the whole Church in an ecumenical Council, or dispersed but in union with their head, in which case they *are* the Church, truly have the fullness of authority'.²⁶ It is, however,

no less true, he added, that this fact does not diminish in any way the personal authority of Peter and his successors. 'These two forms of authority can very well be reconciled without introducing into the Church any kind of dualism, which could only cause confusion. Such would indeed be the case if these two supreme forms of authority were distinct and separate from each other; but to separate the head from the members in this way is, on the contrary, just what is done by those who would have the Pope be submitted to the bishops, collectively or gathered together in a general Council . . . If on the other hand, as is the case, the Pope's authority is exercised 'in solidum' with the bishops, whether they are dispersed or assembled together, no conflict is possible.'²⁷

We must note these precious declarations carefully; it is to be regretted that the Constitution itself bears no trace of them. One cannot of course, as Mgr Deschamps recalled very opportunely, expect a Council to treat all possible questions which may occur on the occasion of a dogmatic definition;²⁸ such a definition is in the nature of things precise in its scope, and bears upon an object which is strictly limited. One is nevertheless free to feel that this would have been the place to have recalled the collegiate aspect of the Church's government, and that a more specific mention of it would have disarmed many criticisms.

It will no doubt be the task of the second Vatican Council to restore the balance. The declarations of the Deputation of the Faith, to which we have called attention together with the views of certain of the Fathers of the Council, may prepare the way for this work of theological elaboration. We shall therefore, by way of conclusion, offer a few reflections which may serve towards this end.

MEANING AND FUNCTION OF THE APOSTOLIC PRIMACY

If we desire to arrive at a better understanding of the place and function of the pontifical Primacy, we must first ask ourselves what Christ's own purpose was when, from among the whole group of Apostles whom He had personally chosen, He set aside one of their number to be the leader in the carrying out of the apostolic mission which He confided to all together.

This special function which was given to Peter as the leader of a collective mission, and the intimate bonds of unity between this leader and the others which result from it, have been admirably

outlined in an amendment which was proposed by Mgr Mermillod, auxiliary Bishop of Geneva, by way of a general introduction to the Constitution *Pastor aeternus*: 'Christ, our Lord, in establishing, like a wise architect, the foundations of the Church upon the twelve Apostles, chose one among them upon whom He constructed the Church as on a cornerstone. This Apostle He has joined inseparably to the others in such a way that man can never separate them; from this it follows that it is possible neither for the body of the bishops to be separated from the Roman Pontiff who is its head, nor for the head to be separated from the body; otherwise the whole would be destroyed. For the members without the head, and likewise the head without the members are dead: and while the members are governed by the head, the head in turn is borne and supported by the members.'²⁹

It is by way of this idea of the unity which lies at the heart of a singular diversity, which the author whom we have just quoted compares to its transcendent exemplar, the Trinity-in-Unity Itself, that we can best make our approach, it seems to me, to an understanding of the profound meaning of the papal Primacy. In the same way that Peter is *one* because the Apostles are *many*, emissaries of the unique Envoy of the Father, so there is but one Pope precisely because there are *many* bishops and because at the same time there can be but *one* Bishop: Jesus Christ, 'pastor and bishop of our souls' (I Peter 2, 25).

In reality, the function of the Pope, as we have already seen, corresponds exactly to that of Peter: to assure, and if need be to impose the unity of action of the apostolic body which Christ, 'apostle' of the Father, has sent into the world for its salvation.

We must note that this diversity in the apostolic mission belongs to its very nature, and is anterior to the specific function given to Peter, for it is quite clear that it has been instituted by Christ in a way which presupposes a plurality of individuals, working together in complete solidarity towards a single and common end, while each at the same time preserves the freedom of action and initiative and the personal responsibility which is indispensable for the accomplishment of his particular task.

The reason for this collegiate structure of the apostolic office, as Christ has established it, is not far to seek. The very extensiveness of the field of the apostolate—that of the world itself, with the qualitative diversity of persons, peoples and cultures which this implies—demands a great diversity of individuals who may act

efficaciously as mediators between the one Christ and the whole human race. If the Saviour is to gather together the whole of humanity into a single body, it is clear that the only way in which this saving activity can fully and effectively reach all those who are separated from each other by so great distances and by so much else as well, is by the presence everywhere of His specifically commissioned and authorised emissaries, which is what the Apostles are. In other words, the very notion of a universal Church presupposes *Churches*, that is to say local communities of the faithful, each of which is the bearer of the fullness of God's gift of salvation to man, together with the faithful steward who is responsible for the administration of His household.

Each of the Apostles who was sent out by Christ Himself was a mediator of His fullness, and to this end he possessed a specific pastoral authority which he had received directly from Christ³⁰ as a participation in His own messianic authority; an authority, however, which was to be maintained in harmony with that of the other Apostles by reference to a Primacy in the leadership of the Church, which in turn was conferred by Christ on Peter.

Thus while single in its origin—Christ Himself—this apostolic authority was to be universal in its scope, and was therefore to be shared 'in solidum' by all, in other words possessed by each in its fullness in relation to all the others, under the supreme direction of Peter. According to the common opinion of Catholic theologians, the very amplitude of the apostolic mission which was entrusted to the founders of the Church required it to be so.

In commissioning their successors in the local communities which they had founded, the Apostles transmitted to them their own pastoral authority,³¹ now, however, in more specific relation to the particular Church over which it was to be exercised, so that each bishop became the mediator of the saving inheritance for the flock which was entrusted to him. At the same time, since the apostolic mission remains always universal in its source and in its scope, each participates—in organic unity with the rest of his brethren in the episcopate—in the universal mission which is the concern of the whole Church. It is thus that the handing on of the Apostles' authority and mission has always been understood by Catholic tradition,³² when it has seen in the college of the bishops a prolongation of the apostolic college with its divinely established structure, with the exception of the privileges which were specifically accorded to the Apostles as immediate witnesses

and founders of the Church, described by theologians as their personal infallibility and universal jurisdiction.

The successor of Peter, bishop among bishops—for he is and remains the pastor of the bishopric of Rome—is called by the office which he inherits to continue the function of Peter, that of unifying and of coordinating the pastoral activities of his brethren the other bishops in the harmony of a single faith and communion, together with the general oversight of the whole flock. His specific task of supreme pastor is thus one of universal superintendence, which is exercised both *over* and *from within* the collegial group of the bishops. It is surely in the light of these two responsibilities taken together that we can best understand the delicate equilibrium of the function of the Supreme Pontiff. As the instrument of unity, the Pope stands above the other members of the apostolic college, each of whom participates as a member, and only as such, in the universal pastorate; in which the Pope, on the other hand, has a specific and personal authority. This pre-eminence extends over each of the members, and over all of them taken collectively, which explains why the Vatican Council took such care to guard against the doctrinal deviations of classical gallicanism.³³

Yet the fact remains that this papal authority, however much it may for a particular reason be emphasized and proclaimed, is only in practice exercised from within a collegial group, with which it always retains the closest of links, for the Pope cannot dispense with the bishops, who are given to him as obligatory associates, just as the Twelve were associated together with Peter.

The tradition of the early centuries bears witness to the fact that these two aspects of the pontifical authority have always been closely connected together. If it is true that the primatial aspect was frequently emphasized by the Roman See—for indeed so it behoves authority to affirm its rights, which are not always acknowledged—it is equally true that this pontifical authority was never either claimed by the Popes nor recognised by the bishops except in the context of a common solidarity in which the first among the bishops took his place as the natural admonisher of his brethren, heir as he was to the prerogatives of Peter. On this point, the Western tradition of the undivided Church of before the schism of the eleventh century is no different from that of the East.³⁴

The Pope and the bishops together thus exercise an immediate authority over the universal Church, though unequally, since the

Pope exercises it by special right, as Supreme Pastor, while the bishop does so as a member of the episcopal body, which is only constituted as a college in virtue of its principle of unity. The relationship between the Pope and the bishops is thus a reciprocal one: just as the latter only have universal authority inasmuch as they form part of the apostolic college in virtue of their union with Peter, so the Pope only exercises his Primacy *in union with* the bishops and in taking account of their collaboration, which is as such divinely intended and pre-ordained.

Note that we say: *in union with* the bishops, and not: in juridical dependence on their assent, as if their co-operation constituted in any way a limit to his authority. For in this divine disposition which governs the relationship between Pope and bishops, there is no possibility of any conflict of rights. Just as the real authority which is exercised by the bishops as successors of the Apostles, by divine right, neither restricts nor diminishes the fullness of apostolic authority which is conferred personally on Peter and his successors, so the supreme jurisdiction of the Pope does not replace but rather confirms the apostolic authority of the bishops who, if it is true that they always remain his subordinates, are none the less necessarily associated together with him.

This apostolic authority of the bishops is, we have said, an 'ordinary' and 'immediate' authority, which is exercised in the name of Christ; it is thus not merely a delegation of the *personal* authority of the Supreme Pontiff. This is so completely beyond any doubt that the question arises whether it is possible for jurisdictional authority to exist and to be transmitted in the local Churches in the absence of any continued and actual dependence on the Supreme Pontiff.

THE JURISDICTION OF THE BISHOPS

The question which we must now consider is one of those at issue in the controversy between the Catholic Church and Orthodoxy, about which there exists a difference of opinion among Catholic theologians themselves. Since it is directly connected with the theme of this article, we may perhaps be permitted to propose an attempt at a solution of the problem which is in conformity with the position which we have outlined above.

Catholic doctrine holds that ordination confers a 'character', implying what is generally called a 'power of Order' which cannot

again be lost, even in an unworthy subject; it is held, however, that this power of Order, in the absence of the related but distinct power of jurisdiction, does not in itself confer the canonical 'mission'. This power of jurisdiction is conferred, for a bishop of the Latin rite, by the Supreme Pontiff; and it is a theological opinion which has been commonly held since the Council of Trent, that the Pope is the immediate source of *all* episcopal jurisdiction.³⁵

Without in any way minimising the weight of this common opinion of the theologians, it is none the less legitimate to ask whether this theory, which we may designate as 'Roman', presupposes that this privilege forms an essential part of the function of the papal Primacy, or whether it is not rather a *de facto* situation, which is the result of the concrete historical circumstances in which the Primacy has been exercised in the Latin Church.

It is in fact certain that in the East, from time immemorial, bishops have been invested with the jurisdiction which is proper to their office by the very fact of their consecration; a situation which has recently been confirmed by the Church in the newly-promulgated Code of Oriental Canon Law.³⁶ It was sufficient for a bishop to notify the fact of his consecration according to the canons by the appropriate letters to his brethren in the episcopate with whom his Church was currently in relation, for him to be recognised immediately as a legitimate bishop in the Church.³⁷ According to the oriental conception, the consecrating bishops would appear to act as tacitly delegated for this purpose by the universal 'Communion' of the Church. Even though there was not, at the beginning, any very clear distinction made between the power of Order and that of jurisdiction, one may consider that the consecrating bishops, being themselves in communion with the great apostolic Sees, regarded themselves as empowered to transmit all the canonical powers which are inherent in the episcopal office, by reason of their participation 'in solidum' in the apostolic authority, of which they were inheritors in virtue of their own consecration.

In all this procedure, as is well known, no previous approval was ever asked from the Bishop of Rome. The fact is there, and the Roman Church acquiesced in this situation for many centuries, even after it had come to be recognised, in the person of its Pontiff, as the obligatory centre of ecclesiastical communion.

In the perspective of the 'Roman' theory according to which the Pope is the source of all jurisdiction, may one not suppose a

permanent communication of this privilege of conferring jurisdiction to other bishops who in turn can confer it on others without the need for an explicit act of assent on the part of the original source of this power? There would seem to be no possible argument against such a supposition, once it is admitted that the apostolic authority, which is conferred on the bishops by divine right, is really possessed by them in participation in the fullness of authority which is conferred on Peter's successor. If this is so, there is no reason why the bishops should not in their turn be the organs for the transmission of this authority; it is enough that the Pope be recognised as being its principal source and supreme possessor, and that he may, when necessary, suspend or abrogate a particular bishop's power of jurisdiction, if and when the universal good of the Church demands it.

THE CASE OF THE ORTHODOX BISHOPS

The situation of the oriental bishops who are separated from Rome may perhaps serve as an illustration of the above suggestion, and help to clarify the discussion. Do these bishops, from the Catholic point of view, possess real jurisdiction?³⁸ If they do, it is evident that they do not hold it directly from the Pope, with whom they are not in communion. If, however, we admit that the schism which exists between East and West is not a formal one, but is to be regarded simply as a breaking off of communion with Rome on the part of the Eastern Churches,³⁹ such as occurred frequently between local Churches during the early centuries,⁴⁰ one may legitimately consider that there are many reasons for recognising that these bishops exercise jurisdiction over their respective flocks. From the point of view of Catholic theology, the administration of certain of the sacraments presupposes in the minister of those sacraments a power of jurisdiction: in the case of the sacrament of penance, for example, in which the possession of jurisdiction on the part of the priest is necessary for the validity of the absolution which is pronounced. Now it is fairly clear that the Catholic Church recognises the validity of the sacrament of penance which is administered in the Orthodox Church, for an Orthodox who is admitted to her communion is not asked to make any confession previous to his reception, but only a profession of Catholic faith. Thus if jurisdiction, which is

necessary to every priest before he can absolve validly, has been conferred on the Orthodox priest, this can only have been done by his own bishop. And it is surely natural to consider that this latter had received his jurisdiction together with his ordination, according to the usual canonical rules, and that this transmission of a canonical authority over his flock was effected in his case by the consecrating bishops in the name of the whole episcopal college in which resides, according to Orthodox theology, the fullness of apostolic authority.

Is it in fact necessary to hold that the conscious and intentional breaking off of communion with the See of Rome means that these bishops can no longer transmit a power of jurisdiction which, *ex hypothesi*, they possess? Still in the perspective of what we have called the 'Roman' theory, one can say that the only obstacle to this transmission would be a formal refusal on the part of the Pope to allow such a transmission by procuration. And it is reasonable to think that, since it is important for the good of souls that the powers which are necessary to the bishops' pastoral mission are in fact conferred on them, notwithstanding the schism, inasmuch as jurisdiction forms part of these powers it is conferred on them at the moment of their consecration. One may presuppose, in this case, the tacit approval of the Supreme Pontiff; the fact in any case remains that a canonical 'mission' is given without an express act of the Supreme Pastor, and that as a result the Orthodox Bishop becomes a successor of the Apostles in regard to the particular flock which is entrusted to him.

If the above interpretation is correct, this case of the Orthodox bishops provides a concrete confirmation of the position which we have proposed: that it is not essential for the transmission of episcopal jurisdiction that it be expressly conferred by the supreme authority. There are no doubt various qualifications which would have to be brought in as regards the particular case of the Orthodox bishops. It is clear that the effectual separation of such a bishop from the centre of Catholic unity creates a situation which is abnormal and detrimental to his mission: while he is by the fact of his ordination and of the canonical authority which goes with it a member 'in solidum' of the episcopal college, the Orthodox bishop is in fact deprived, by reason of the break in communion with the successor of Peter and notwithstanding his undoubted good faith, of a divinely established principle of regulation which guarantees the normal exercise of his pastoral mission, even within

his own Church ; moreover, the mere fact of the separation prevents the legitimate exercise of his collegial authority over the universal Church, because no exercise of this authority is possible where there is no actual communion with the Pope, who is the guarantee of the unity of the bishops and the cornerstone of the hierarchy.

The strange nature of this situation should not astonish us : it is the consequence of a state of affairs which has resulted from the accidents of history, and in which it is difficult to affirm that one can see gathered together all the criteria for a schism in the strict canonical sense. Canon Law, which prefers to deal in clear and unambiguous categories, has so far scarcely given any attention to these intermediate situations which escape precise regulation, and still less has it legislated for them. There are other and similar examples which the history of the Church has left us, of which the great Western schism would be one. Nor is it impossible that we should be presented with others in the future ; already in our time there are Churches which are in communion with Rome and yet are cut off from all relationships with the centre of catholicity, and which may have to live for an indeterminate period, sealed off as it were behind the iron or bamboo curtain, in a complete autonomy imposed by the circumstances which is yet at the same time a continuation of an authentically Catholic Church life.⁴¹

CONCLUSION

At the Vatican Council, when a very large minority of the Fathers rejected with so much vehemence a conception of the pontifical Primacy and of its all-powerful universality which seemed to them to be reducing the Church to an absolute monarchy, it was not only the relative autonomy of their apostolic authority which they were defending, but it was also the true meaning of the Primacy itself, which they sought to safeguard from an interpretation which was both abusive and pregnant with misunderstandings.

If the bishops of the Catholic Church are not merely the Pope's vicars general, as was reiterated so often from all sides at the Vatican Council, then they are his natural and obligatory associates in the oversight of the whole flock, and one cannot strictly speaking define the true structure and character of his supreme function without treating at the same time of the function of the bishops.

The Fathers of the Vatican Council of whom we have spoken, in setting themselves against any such disjunction of different but inseparable functions in the apostolic mission, did so in the name of an organic conception of the Church⁴² which they found in Scripture and in Tradition, as their theological arguments make abundantly clear; and they drew from this conception, moreover, the most concrete of practical consequences.

Christ has set up Peter over the whole Church, in the midst of an apostolic college, to which He has entrusted His mission of salvation which is to be accomplished in unity: in Peter alone resides the ultimate source and plenitude of the apostolic authority. If, as the Vatican Council has reminded us, the Supreme Pontiff is the inheritor of this plenitude, it can only be that he has been set there as a moderator, a 'minister generalissimus'⁴³ to quote the expression of the Bishop of Grenada at the Council of Trent, and also 'in order that he might communicate it'⁴⁴ to the brethren whom Christ has given him to be associated and co-responsible with him in his own mission.

It remains now for the Magisterium, which in a previous Council has recalled the strict and inalienable rights which derive from the pontifical Primacy, to perform a further difficult and delicate task: to make more clearly manifest the purpose for which these rights have been conferred, and the obligations which are inseparable from them, by expounding in the coming Council the mystery of the 'communion' which is the very principle of the relationships which bind together the ecclesiastical Hierarchy, as it is of the heavenly Hierarchy.

GEORGES DEJAIFVE, S.J.,

Louvain.

¹ In the case of the Orthodox, the Anglicans and the Old Catholics, this is so evident that to give bibliographical references would be pointless. For the Reformed tradition, we may quote R. Mehl:

'Why is it that a certain dialogue and even ecumenical co-operation is possible with the Orthodox, but not with the Roman Church? There is only one possible answer: the claim of the Infallibility of the Supreme Pontiff, and the absolute authority demanded by the Pope.' (*Du catholicisme romain*, 1957, chap. iv, p. 32.)

² Cf. the remark of Mgr Gollmayr, Archbishop of Goritz and Gradiška (Venezia), at the Vatican Council: 'observat vix ullum fidei articulum adeo schismaticis et protestantibus exosum esse quam catholica de

primatu doctrina'. He added: 'quapropter haec doctrina cum magna prudentiae et circumspectione proponenda est ne adversariorum animi magis magisque exacerbentur et ab unione cum Ecclesia catholica deterreantur' (Observatio 40 in caput XI schematis 'De Ecclesia Christi', Mansi, t. 51, c. 957, B).

⁸ See our 'Sobornost or Papacy', *E.C.Q.* Autumn 1953, pp. 115ff. For more details cf. Granderath, *Histoire du Concile du Vatican*, tome III.

⁹ Given in Mansi, t. 51, col. 929-68.

¹⁰ 'Nullus iam erit ingenuus . . . lector qui non lacunam animadvertat qua tota episcopalis ordinis potestas et iurisdictio praetermissa fuit', remarked Mgr Schwarzenberg, Archbishop of Prague (Mansi, t. 51, c. 930, D.).

¹¹ A number of the Fathers urged that the Constitution was defective: 'ne manca sit et in essentialibus minime absoluta constitutio de Ecclesia Christi, necessarium esse ut ex professo de instituto divinitus apostolatu episcoporum tractetur' (Mgr Fürstenberg, *ibid.*, c. 932, B). 'Imperfecta et manca esset . . . si loqui negligeret de reliquis apostolis et eorum successoribus, episcopis . . .' (Mgr Haynald, *ibid.*, c. 937, C).

¹² Nequaquam maiestatem primatus cognoscere et admirari faciat . . . opus esse ut ordinis episcoporum mentio eorumque muneris explanatio fiat', remark three German bishops (*ibid.*, c. 929, B).

¹³ 'Hoc caput primatum quasi ab apostolatu avulsam exhibet et tractat, iusta etiam primatus ratio et finis immediatus non sat dilucide apparet', writes Mgr Tarnoczy, *ibid.*, c. 935, B-C. Cp. the similar observations of Mgr Krementz (c. 948, C), of Mgr Moreno (c. 949, C) and of Mgr Jirsik (c. 965, A).

¹⁴ 'Desideratur tractatus de episcopis tanquam apostolorum successoribus sine quo vera idea primatus eiusque in ecclesia hierarchica ratio neque intelligi neque exponi potest.' (*Ibid.*, c. 936, A.)

¹⁵ 'Animadvertitur de ommissa doctrina circa iura episcoporum. Huius animadversionis ratio partim habita est in hoc ipso constitutionis schemate de primatu Romani Pontificis et partim in altera constitutione de Ecclesia Christi fusiore modo habebitur' (Mansi, t. 52, c. 4, C).

¹⁶ Cf. the original text in Mansi, t. 52, c. 4, C.

¹⁷ For the remarks of Mgr Martinez and of Mgr Thomas, cf. *ibid.*, c. 628, C and 629, D; the addition is to be found in c. 632, B.

¹⁸ 'Desiderio auctorum emendationum satisfit, in quantum fieri potest, per hoc additamentum, in quo disertis verbis exhibetur divina institutio cum indivisa unitate episcopatus, in quo etiam exhibentur omnes pastores, omnes fideles sibi invicem coadunati per vinculum primatus summi pontificis' (*ibid.*, c. 637, A).

¹⁹ Cf. the text in Denzinger, 1821.

²⁰ Cf. the annotations 7 (Mgr Wiery), 8 (Mgr Amat) and 9 (Mgr Thomas) in Mansi, t. 52, c. 631. Mgr Amat notes that: 'Ex variis sacrae Scripturae textibus clare apparet Christum ipsum, qui fidei et caritatis auctor est et dicitur, esse etiam earum, proprie loquendo, principium' (c. 631, B). Mgr Dupanloup had already made a similar remark in his observations on Chapter XI of the presynodal schema (Mansi, t. 51, c. 955 B, n. 39).

²¹ 'J.C. . . . posuit in ipsa constitutione ecclesiae illud . . . quod de se aptum est et efficax ad conservandam fidei et communionis unitatem heri, hodie et in saecula . . . ad conservandos in professione eiusdem fidei et sinu eiusdem communionis omnes sparsos per universam terram et in omnibus aliis inter se diversos . . . auctoritas visibilis, palpabilis, residens in ipsa persona Petri et successorum eius.' (Mansi, t. 52, c. 638-39.)

²² 'Vox: principium non eandem notionem exhibet atque eundem respectum ac vox: centrum unitatis . . . nam principium proprie signi-

ficat relationem summi pontificis ad membra ecclesiae, dum centrum unitatis significat relationem membrorum ecclesiae ad pontificem' (ibid., c. 639, B).

¹⁸ 'Principium est quid intrinsecum primatui ecclesiae' (ibid.).

¹⁹ 'Ut vero episcopatus ipse unus et indivisus esset et per cohaerentes sibi invicem sacerdotes credentium multitudo universa in fidei et communionis unitate conservaretur, beatum Petrum coeteris apostolis praeponens in ipso instituit perpetuum utriusque unitatis principium ac visibile fundamentum . . .' (Dz. 1821.)

²⁰ 'Probatio primatus Petri ex textu Matt. 17, 18-19 tunc demum solide et contra obiectiones tute conficitur si simul exponitur in qua relatione fundamentum Petri ad fundamenta omnium versetur apostolorum, super quod, testante S. Paulo (Eph. 2) aedificati sunt fideles et quomodo Petri potestas solvendi et ligandi ad similem omnium apostolorum potestatem (Matt. 18) se habeat.' (Mansi, t. 52, c. 703, C.)

²¹ 'Petro dictum est sine aliis et non aliis sine Petro, ut intelligatur sic ei attributa potestas huiusmodi ut aliis sine ipso esse non possit, ipsi sine aliis esse possit ex privilegio sibi collato et ex concessa sibi plenitudine potestatis' (ibid., c. 714, A).

²² 'Ergo, dicit aliquis et dictum est, omnimoda et plena potestas erit absque ulla limitatione in Petro? Utique duplicem habet limitationem, activam unam, ut ita dicam, et alteram passivam.

Habet activam ex parte Christi donantis, qui ait: ego Christus Deus tibi dabo, ego rogavi pro te, pascere oves meas. Itaque tantam habet potestatem Petrus quantum illi dedit Christus Dominus non in destructionem sed in aedificationem corporis Christi quod est ecclesia.

Sed est alia limitatio passiva, si ita loqui fas est, ab ipso Christo posita ex parte apostolorum. Christus enim ut sapiens architecta posuit Petrum fundamentalem petram super quam aedificaret ecclesiam. Sed ipse idem Christus designavit aedificatores quibus Petrus ad aedificandam ecclesiam uteretur, hoc est apostolos ibi praesentes. Petrus constitutus est magister . . . ad confirmandos alios, sed isti alii non debent esse nisi illi quos ipse Christus dedit Petro fratres in apostolatu . . . atque adeo sibi in fratres elegerat . . . Petrus debet pascere agnos, sed isti agni non debent generari nisi per illas oves, quas Christus ipse Petro pascendas assignabat . . . Ergo suprema et plena potestas est in Petro qui tamen *non potest, non debet* exercere eam per alios coadiutores suos nisi per apostolos eorumque successores' (ibid., c. 715, B-C).

²³ 'Multo maior difficultas et vera impossibilitas exurgit uberius definiendi rationem primatus nisi simul de episcoporum definiatur potestate. Quomodo de centro et apice, de summo praeside et capite sermo dogmaticus instituetur nisi coetera apostolatus membra, nisi illi qui simul hierarchiae sacrae partes sunt, considerentur? Organismus episcopatus unus est modo utique inaequali a Christo institutus, sed quidquid de una parte statuitur in altera reflectitur, quod de capite definitur, simul in membra redundat . . . Si Petrus est pastor ovium et agnorum, pastores etiam episcopi sunt. Petrus solvit ligatque, utrumque apostolorum quoque esse edicitur: nullane inter utrumque relatio? Summi Pontificis iurisdictio vocatur ordinaria et immediata; quomodo episcoporum ordinaria et immediata iurisdictio cum ea concilietur? Haec quaestio num ab hoc loco aliena erit?' (Mansi, t. 52, c. 94-95).

²⁴ Several of the Fathers called attention to this fact in connexion with the Chapter XI of the presynodal schema, but the same objection is valid in regard to the revised schema which became the Constitution *Pastor aeternus*. The following remark of Mgr Eberhard of Trier may be quoted: 'Non placet quod tota fere expositio quasi iuridica quaedam vindictio

dura et arida est, illa unctione qua exempli gratia concilii Tridentini decretis, catechismi romani expositionibus, etc. inest et legentium animos dulciter attrahit, omnino carens, primatum in ecclesia Christi ad instar severissimae saecularium principum dominationis ostendit; paternum vero huius primatus characterem, clementem, beneficam, amabilem primatus auctoritatem, perennem pro ecclesia et toto mundi salutis fontem, ex hac divina institutione manantem vix leviter tangit. Hac expositionis (non rei) duritia et asperitate tanquam iugum durum magis quam ut amabile Dei beneficium populis huius saeculi primatus apparebit'. (Mansi, t. 51, n. 47, c. 961, C). Cf. also the remark of the redoubtable Mgr Strossmayer: 'Auctores schematis doctrinam de primatu *iuristico* quodam et *contentioso* modo exposuerunt ita ut nihil ieiunius, nihil sterilius excogitari possit.' (Ibid., n. 58, c. 965, D.)

²⁶ Cf. the amendments to Chapter III, no. 35 and 36 (ibid., c. 1092, A-B).

²⁷ 'Concedimus libenter et nos in concilio oecumenico sive in episcopis coniunctum cum suo capite supremam inesse et plenam ecclesiasticam potestatem in fideles omnes . . . Igitur episcopi congregati cum capite in concilio oecumenico, quo in casu totam ecclesiam repraesentant, aut dispersi sed cum suo capite, quo in casu sunt ipsa ecclesia, vere plenam potestatem habent' (ibid., c. 1109, C).

²⁸ 'Quae duo amice consistere possunt, quin dualismus qui confusionem parit introducat in ecclesiam. Hoc postremum incommodum obtineret, si duae ab invicem distinctae et separatae vere plenae et supremae potestates admitterentur; aut separare caput a membris est proprium illorum qui subiciunt papam episcopis collective sumptis aut repraesentatis a concilio generali . . . Si summus Pontifex una cum episcopis, vel dispersis vel congregatis vere plenam et supremam potestatem in solidum exercet, nulla possibilis collisio' (ibid., c. 1109, D-1110, B).

²⁹ Cf. his discourse of the 7th June in reply to that of Cardinal Schwarzenberg: 'a conciliis non conscribi tractatum seu cursum theologiae. Concilium non agit modo systematico de omnibus illis questionibus, quae reduci possunt ad unam aliamve materiam dogmaticam; sed partes concilii sunt clare et fortiter exponere veritates oppositas erroribus hic et nunc vigentibus' (ibid., c. 529, B).

³⁰ Christus Dnus, dum ut sapiens architecta, in duodecim apostolis ponebat Ecclesiae fundamenta duodecim, unum inter eos elegit super quem tanquam super principalem petram aedificavit Ecclesiam. Hunc autem et illos ita coniunxit inseparabiliter ut iam homo separare non possit; hinc neque corpus episcoporum a Romano Pontifice, capite suo neque caput a corpore disiungi valebit; secus totius ruina sequeretur. Siquidem membra sine capite et caput sine membris pariter mortua sunt et si membra capite reguntur, caput membris portatur' (Mansi, t. 52, c. 632, C-D).

³¹ It is true that at the Vatican Council, the Deputation of the Faith favoured the opinion which was maintained at the Council of Trent by the Archbishop of Rossano, Castagna, the future Urban VII, and shared by a good number of the Fathers, according to which the apostolic authority was transmitted to the Apostles by the intermediary of Peter. (Cf. Mansi, t. 52, c. 9, C). On the other hand, apart from the fact that this opinion was far from being shared by the Fathers of the Council as a whole and thus was never imposed, one is free to hold that the apostolic mission and authority was conferred immediately by Christ on all the apostles, with the exception of the special privilege of Peter. The exegesis of the relevant scriptural texts, both at the Council of Trent and at that of the Vatican, was to some extent influenced by the thesis which the partisans

of this teaching wished to prove. As for the distinction which was proposed by Cajetan in his 'De comparatione auctoritatis Papae et concilii' between the 'potestas exsecutionis' which is given to all; and the 'potestas praeceptiva vel regiminis', conferred on Peter alone, it is more ingenious than illuminating.

²¹ We mean by 'pastoral authority' the habitual and normal conjunction of the powers of order and of jurisdiction in the apostolic ministry.

²² St Cyprian, in his 'De unitate Ecclesiae', is the classical witness of this tradition, with the exception of his error concerning the Primacy of the Bishop of Rome. It was, however, on occasion recalled by the Popes: cf. the letter of Celestinus I to the Council of Ephesus (Epist. 18; P.L., 50, 505).

²³ Cf. the Constitution 'Pastor aeternus', Chap. III; Denzinger 1827.

²⁴ Cf. for Augustine, who speaks for the whole of the West, the book of Batiffol, *Le catholicisme de S. Augustin*, t. 2, pp. 411-72, and the very perceptive pages of F. Hofmann, *Der Kirchenbegriff des Hg. Augustinus*, 1933, pp. 425-55.

²⁵ Cf. the discourse of Castagna at the Council of Trent, in which the arguments in favour of this opinion are collected, in the *Concilium Tridentinum* of the Görresgesellschaft, t. IX, pp. 112-22. A summary of them will be found in A. Michel, *Les décrets du Concile de Trente*, in Hefele-Leclercq, *Histoire des Conciles*, t. X, p. 476, n. 1.

²⁶ Cf. the *Motu proprio Cleri Sanctitati*, 'de personis', c. 396, 2, and the article of A. Wuyts, s.j., *Le droit des personnes dans l'Eglise orientale*, in *Nouvelle Revue Théologique*, 1958, p. 379. Also the study of K. Mörsdorf, *Patriarch und Bischof im neuen Ostkirchlichen Recht*, in the volume dedicated to Otto Karrer, *Beggnung der Christen*, p. 477.

²⁷ On this practice of epistolary correspondence as a means of maintaining communion in the early Church, cf. the article of L. Hertling, s.j., *Communio und Primat*, in *Miscellanea Historiae Pontificiae*, vol. VII, pp. 1-48, Rome, 1943.

²⁸ The question has in the past been studied by T. H. Metz, *Le clergé orthodoxe a-t-il juridiction?* in *Irenikon*, 1928, pp. 142 sq.

²⁹ It is evident that the rupture was a voluntary one, but also a legitimate one, from the Orthodox point of view, because it was the outcome of issues which they consider to touch the faith itself: fidelity to the sacred deposit of tradition and to a conception of the Church which for them has been inherited from Christ and the Apostles. We have not the space here to enlarge upon this notion of the 'breaking off of communion', or of 'estrangement', as Father Congar has very appropriately called it; reference may be made to his excellent study: *After Nine Hundred Years*, Fordham University Press, 1959 (French original in *L'Eglise et les Eglises*, Chevetogne, t. 1, pp. 3-95).

If we wish to understand the paradoxical situation which has resulted from the 'Eastern schism', the following comparison may be of assistance: suppose that on an island, which as become cut off from all relations with the rest of the world, a good number of parish priests, together with their parishes, break off all relationships with their bishop, whom they accuse, in complete sincerity, of having overstepped his divinely established rights and of endangering doctrinal orthodoxy. They have no intention of separating themselves from the Church (for one Bishop is not the whole Church), but sincerely believe that they are in communion with the rest of the Catholic Church. It is of no avail for His Lordship to admonish, and eventually to excommunicate them, for he is considered to be acting as judge in his own cause. Only some higher authority, or the universal witness of the faith could take away all possible doubt. In the case of the

'Eastern schism', the situation is complicated by the fact that it is bishops, together with their Churches who have broken off communion, that the other patriarchates of the East have acted in solidarity with Constantinople, and that the oriental tradition has never clearly recognised to the Bishop of Rome what for us is revealed doctrine: his *jure divino* Primacy of Jurisdiction.

⁴⁰ An example would be the so-called schism of Antioch in the fourth century, and the series of confused situations which resulted from it. Certain bishops, such as St Basil, who were in communion with the See of Rome, were in communion with the Meletians, with whom Rome itself was not in communion. For the history of these events, cf. the article of Amand de Mendieta, *Damase, Athanase, Pierre, Mélèce et Basile—Les rapports de communion ecclésiastique entre les églises de Rome, d'Alexandrie, d'Antioche et de Césarée de Cappadoce* (370-9), in *L'Eglise et les églises*, t. I, pp. 261-77.

⁴¹ This situation is of course different from that of the Orthodox Churches in that in it there is a material impossibility of giving expression to the communion of hearts and minds, whereas in the latter case there is a formal refusal of communion with Rome.

⁴² Cf. the discourse of Mgr Ketteler on the 23rd of May: 'In corpore humano omnia membra actibus suis ab invicem dependent, caput a corpore et corpus a capite; caput nequit agere sine cooperatione aliorum membrorum et tamen caput propterea non cessat esse supremum membrum et caput . . . Idem valet de divino organismo Ecclesiae, ubi nulla pars est omnino independens, nulla pars; Romanus Pontifex est caput Ecclesiae docentis et supremus iudex et sine illo nequit fieri supremum iudicium. Sed qui putat R.P. non posse vere tanquam supremum iudicem agere nisi omnino independentem agat et exclusa omni cooperatione tum omnium membrorum tum totius corporis Ecclesiae, ipse solvit constitutionem quam Christus Ecclesiae dedit' (Mansi, t. 52, c. 208, A-B). Cf. also in the same sense the discourse of Mgr Sola, Bishop of Nice, on the 10th of June, *ibid.*, c. 584-85.

⁴³ Cf. the votum of the Bishop of Grenada in *Concil. Trid.*, t. IX, pp. 48-51.

⁴⁴ 'Ei Christus dedit omnem iurisdictionem ut eam aliis conferret', wrote Father Laynez, who however, elsewhere holds that jurisdiction was conferred immediately by Christ on the Apostles, *Conc. Trid.*, t. IX, p. 225.

A WORD ABOUT THE GREAT LAVRA

IN 1963 the great Lavra of St Athanasios will celebrate the millenary of its foundation. In the spirit of reunion which animates the Church especially at this time, the Abbot Primate has invited Benedictines the world over to celebrate this event. The Abbot suggested that the feast of St Athanasios, kept by our Orthodox brethren on the 5th July, be introduced into the Benedictine calendar, and that there should be a monastic pilgrimage to Mount Athos during the course of the millenary year.

This summer a Benedictine friend of mine asked me if I would accompany him to the Holy Mountain and to the Lavra. Although I had been to the Holy Mountain before I had never visited the Lavra, so I readily agreed to my friend's proposal.

When St Athanasios, a native of Trebizonde, arrived on Mount Athos in 958, he found the peninsula already inhabited by colonies of hermits.

The life of the saint has interesting parallels with that of St Benedict, the great patriarch of western monasticism. At a very early age he consecrated his life to the service of the Lord, like St Benedict abandoning his studies to seek the solitude of an ascetic's cell.

He entered a semi-eremitical monastery in Bythnia where his Abbot charged him with the spiritual direction of Nicephoras Phocas, the future emperor of Byzantium. It was, of course, at this time that the friendship between Phocas and Athanasios was cemented. An eloquent testimony of this friendship is a precious Gospel Book donated to Athanasios by the emperor, to be seen in the treasury of the monastery. Moreover, the emperor himself had encouraged the building of the monastery, hoping one day to retire there.

It was only in 963 that Athanasios founded the Lavra and although, as we have seen, he had received his monastic formation from hermits, he preferred to introduce the cenobitic traditions of St Theodor the Studite and St Basil in his newly established community. At the same time he made allowances for those chosen souls who felt the urge to 'do battle alone' (vide the Rule of St Benedict, Chapter I). To this day, in spite of the fact that the Lavra is an idiorythmic monastery, the monks are expected to observe many of the canons in vigour in the cenobia.

My friends and myself had decided to walk across to the Lavra from Katounakia where we had spent a short time among the

hermits. The walk took several hours, so we were glad, on arrival at the monastery, to rest a little. The archondaris, or guest master, received us kindly offering us little cups of coffee and a spoonful of jam. That evening we were served a special supper in a room apart from the other guests.

The monks were up at two o'clock the following morning, but it was not till after eight that we were received by the fathers of the ruling council. The venerable fathers thanked us for having visited them and spent a little time discussing their problems, the chief of which seemed to be the lack of vocations. One of them said he had heard it was the case all over the world and asked our opinion about this.

The main church, known as the Catholicon in Greek, is in the shape of a Greek cross and has served as a model for most of the Athonite churches. It was probably finished about the year 1000. The admirable frescos are the work of the monk Theodor and are considered a chef d'oeuvre of the Cretan school, especially the one which depicts the Dormition of the Blessed Virgin. Other splendid frescos are to be seen in the refectory, thought by some to be the most imposing on the Holy Mountain.

A large number of important relics, including one of St John Chrysostom, are kept in the church, but the most famous one and the most treasured possession of the whole monastery is the body of the holy founder himself. This is kept in a chapel dedicated to the Forty Martyrs, situated to the left of the main church. The tomb of the saint, which has been venerated by thousands upon thousands of pilgrims throughout the centuries, is a marble monument admirable in its simplicity. The large silver plaque with the image of the saint, which acts as a sort of lid to the sarcophagus, was donated by a wealthy Russian. A silken canopy covers the tomb round which seven lamps burn continually.

That afternoon we left the Lavra since the weather was uncertain and we did not want to risk waiting for a later boat as we had decided to be in the Russian monastery for the feast of the Nativity of the Blessed Virgin.

We had the feeling that we left behind us good friends who pray daily to the Holy Spirit near the tomb of their founder to 'come and dwell within us and cleanse us from every stain', and we know that Christ has promised to those who are clean of heart that 'they shall see God'.

JOSEPH MITCHELL,
Pontifical Greek College, Rome.

GRUNDTVIG'S TRANSLATIONS FROM THE GREEK

IN a previous article we considered in a general way something of the nature of the theology of N. F. S. Grundtvig as it is revealed in his hymns. In the present article, I wish to deal in greater detail with three questions. First the particular convictions about the Church and the Christian faith which lie behind his attempt to compile a universal collection of Christian hymns, secondly his success and failures in the work of translation, and thirdly the specific question of his translations from the Greek. If it is the third subject which will contain the material of greatest interest for those studying the Eastern Churches, the two former topics are closely related, and bring forward matter which is of great importance for all who are concerned with Christian unity.

As has already been remarked, Grundtvig was a man of almost demonic energy. The mere volume of his writings, published and unpublished, is daunting and impressive. Throughout his life he was subject to periods of intense psychological depression, followed by periods of elation and activity, which at times passed over into madness. But these attacks, the last of which took place at the age of 84, were always followed by recovery. Indeed his power of recuperation is even more extraordinary than the illness itself. It is against this background that we must consider the writings of 1824-5, which stem from what Grundtvig calls the 'magelose opdagelse' (the matchless, unparalleled, discovery) a decisive moment, if not *the* decisive moment in the development of his religious ideas.

In 1822, Grundtvig was appointed to the Church of our Saviour in Copenhagen, and the mood of depression which had lain upon him for some time was deepened as he felt the deadness of the religious life of the capital. Out of this depression he began to awake in the winter of 1823-4; he felt stirring in him his poetic gifts and began to be aware that he had a message for his contemporaries. He began to see that the life of the Church, the life of each Christian must be the gift of God himself, the work of the Spirit. And these new convictions first took form and crystallised in a pamphlet, *Kirkens Gienmaele*, The Reply of the Church, which appeared in the autumn of 1825. This work is in itself so remarkable, and so important for any understanding of Grundtvig's

later theological position that I intend to quote from it at some length. So far as I know it has never been translated into English. It is, as its title suggests, a reply written by Grundtvig in the name of the Church to a learned work on the doctrines, rites and constitutions of Protestantism and Catholicism, written by H. N. Clausen, one of the Professors at the University in Copenhagen, and published in August 1825. Clausen appears to have been an idealist type of theologian, considerably influenced by Schleiermacher. He argued that the Bible was the foundation principle of Christianity, but only an inadequate expression of the full meaning of the Christian faith. It was the task of theology, 'by philological learning and philosophical criticism to supplement its vagueness and to bring about a higher unity between the different types of doctrine and their methods of presentation'. In this sphere the laity must acknowledge the authority of the theologian, the specialist. Their proper sphere was that of church organisation; the church being described as 'a society for the purpose of advancing general religiousness'.¹

The appearance of this work suddenly sparked off in Grundtvig an enormous outburst of energy. All the convictions, all the ideas which had been forming in his mind during the previous two years, suddenly came together, and within a few days his reply, or rather as he called it *The Church's Reply*, appeared. It is a pamphlet clearly written at a white heat of passionate conviction, and is of an unprecedentedly violent nature. In it Grundtvig denounced Clausen as an anti-Christian teacher, and demanded either that he abjure his unchristian doctrines, or else resign his living and renounce the name of Christian. So personal was the attack that Clausen was able to initiate a libel action in the law courts, which he won, and as a result of which Grundtvig was placed for a number of years under police censorship.

But this personal element in the work is of importance only as demonstrating the intensity of conviction which lay behind Grundtvig's defence and restatement of what he believed to be the Christian faith. 'I know, he writes in the introduction, that the step I am now taking is unusual in our days; to many it will seem laughable, and to many irresponsible, but it is nonetheless premeditated and entirely necessary; unless with my present

¹ I am indebted to Professor Lindhardt's book on Grundtvig for this account of Clausen's work. Cf. P. G. Lindhardt, *Grundtvig, An Introduction* (1951), p. 37.

understanding of things, I am to be a traitor to the Church, in which I have received the hope of salvation and in which I have the calling to dispense and to guard the great Gospel, which is entrusted to me to preach.' And again, 'I know very well that people will cry 'Woe and Alas' at my 'heresy hunting' as they call every protest which the Church makes against its false friends; but I also know that they will have to admit that they have not seen *this* type of 'heresy hunting' recently, indeed not since the book was written from which I have learnt it, that is to say, the blessed book of Irenaeus on the Church's reply, which is now for the first time to be truly understood and used.'² The introduction is dated 'Irenaei Dag, 1825'. However surprising it may seem the whole work is conceived as a renewal and continuation of Irenaeus' *Adversus Haereses*.

What then is its basic idea? It is that Christianity is not a theory to be derived from the Bible and elaborated by professors. It is a great divine-human fact. On the title page stands a quotation from Article VII of the Augsburg Confession, *Una sancta ecclesia perpetuo mansura sit*. The one Church exists; it is founded in the apostolic confession of faith and in the sacraments of the Gospel, Baptism and Eucharist. From this fact we learn what Christianity is, and how the Bible is to be understood. We cannot build the Church on the Bible alone, still less on the interpretations of individual professors. No, it is in the Church and in the sacraments of the Church where God is at work, that we discover what true Christianity is.

'This characteristic quality, he writes, upon which the earliest Church built, and by which it was recognisable not only to its enemies but specially to its friends, must undeniably be found in every Church which can rightly be called Christian; and I maintain that it is found in our own Church and everywhere where the Apostolic Confession of Faith (i.e. the Apostle's Creed) is the exclusive condition for incorporation into the fellowship, and where the means of grace, Baptism and the Supper are granted to have a power which corresponds to the confession of faith, that is a saving power. And this I maintain, not just as a theologian, not just as an ecclesiastical scholar, but principally as a believing member of the great universal Christian Church, which by the

² *Grundtvig*, edited by Hal Koch, Copenhagen, 1950, p. 68 and p. 72. References throughout are to this selection from Grundtvig's writings published by Martins Forlag, in the series *Udvalgte Tanker*.

apostolic confession of faith and the means of grace, not only differentiates itself from Jews, Turks and Heathens, but still more secures its believing members the forgiveness of sins and salvation in the name of Jesus Christ, and this claim of the Church, Professor Clausen and every such protestant tends to refute, when he wishes to deprive our Church's name of the one, true, universal Christian . . .

'Thus we meet Professor Clausen, and all those who will give out their own fantasies as the Christian revelation, their own brain-children as Christianity, with the unshakeable fact that there has been and is a Christendom on earth, recognisable from all else by its unique confession of faith, with which in all its languages and in all its surprising forms it has confessed faith in Jesus Christ, crucified and risen again, as the sure, the only way of salvation for sinners, as a way which leads through Baptism and the Supper to God's Kingdom and the land of the living. Whether or not this is true, whether this dark secret way really does lead to communion with God who is light without shadow, and who alone has true immortality, eternal life, this is something which can be disputed and without evident self-contradiction denied. But what one cannot doubt unless one does not believe ones own eyes, what one cannot deny, unless one is a desperate liar, is that this way is the only Christian way, and that the confession of faith forms the narrow Church door, and is the unchangeable, we believe unshakeable foundation both for faith and learning in the Christian Church. This is a truth as clear as the sun. One wonders how this principle will be contested, that the sacraments with the corresponding confession of faith, which is the one thing that all Christians, in all situations, in all confessions, in all times have had in common, which has both made the Church recognisable to friends and foes, and bound together the community, which has been thus both the trade-mark and the bond of union, that this is the foundation which has up till now answered to the description which the Lord gave of the rock, which despite the gates of hell and the powers of death, should bear up his Church all the days until the end of the world . . . One cannot deny a *fact*, by *reason*, which even the divine omniscient and almighty reason can only explain but never overthrow, or without self-contradiction contest. Nor can one deny it by the New Testament, when that at every point presupposes, and rests and builds upon this same fact. The New Testament is undeniably the Church's witness, the Book is the

light of the Church and the Scripture is explicitly addressed to the community which already believes and is baptised, and is not meant to teach them something new, but only to strengthen and confirm them in their Christian faith.³

From this insistence on the Church's confession of faith, and the power of God working through the sacraments, there follow very important consequences as regards theology, what Grundtvig calls 'the School', as opposed to 'the Church'. The preservation of Christian truth is now seen to be the work of the whole worshipping community (a concept with interesting affinities to the Eastern Orthodox point of view), and the work of the theologian and the Christian thinker can be free as long as it does not contradict that basic rule of faith. But when this is denied, then the denier, the protester, 'the protestant', has by his own action excluded himself from the community of faith, in which alone the Christian life can be lived, and the Christian faith understood.

'It is indeed high time, Grundtvig goes on, that all of us who will in spirit and in truth be Christians should unite ourselves in one to build on the rock, which through the course of time has defied the raging storms and the battering waves, should confine ourselves as the community of faith, as the Church to the cradle at Bethlehem, which history teaches can triumphantly defend itself against all the powers of the world and hell, that we should so to speak turn back to the Sanctuary and hold out our hands to one another, and to all the faithful who sleep in the Lord, over the font, and exchange the kiss of peace before the altar, and should in the one Bread and the one Cup, as brethren let all disputes over doubtful questions drop, and when we are strong not misuse our power to weigh down the weak, but rather to bear with their weaknesses. Yes, Christian friends, wherever you are, it is time that we unite again on that which is Christian, on that which both lay and learned, and those Christian teachers, coming from such different worlds of ideas, such as Justin Martyr and Irenaeus, Anskar and Luther, Reinhold and Balle had in common, and which undeniably is the basically Christian, unite on that, tolerating in one another all theological differences compatible with it, but deviating from it never a hair's breadth either for open enemies or for false friends and solemnly separating ourselves from those who by rejecting the Church's original confession of faith and

³ Op. cit., pp. 94-98.

divine means of grace have separated themselves from us, and who only retain the name of Christian, in order to mislead the congregation under the guise of friendship, and to steal the glory of the Church's great witness, which they do not believe.'

Surely this passage, with its long excited sentences, deserves to be reckoned one of the great prophetic texts of the whole ecumenical movement. Remark the way in which Grundtvig makes the Church's historic confession of faith concrete in the image of 'the crib at Bethlehem', and note too how the unity is described in liturgical and sacramental terms, the joining of hands at the Font, and the Kiss of Peace at the Altar, and includes 'all the faithful who sleep in the Lord'. However strangely Grundtvig's list of witnesses to the Christian faith may read to us, it provides a real testimony to his feeling for the historic continuity of the Church's life, and to his perception of the need for an 'ecumenism in time'.

'But no rule of interpretation (of the scripture) except that the Scripture should be understood by the confession of faith and cannot be understood except by the faithful through the Holy Spirit, no rule of interpretation apart from that has the divine and human witness of the Apostolic Church and of history. To this the Church must hold fast, and allow the School to be free, let the theologians and exegetes add, and if they want to dispute with one another, so long only as they allow that the Holy Scripture is enlightening and edifying for all Christians according to the measure of wisdom and faith which the Lord gives, and so long only as they do not try to make a division between the Scripture and the Church's confession of faith, by doing which naturally they exclude themselves both from the Church and from the Church-School. Indeed in this way, we applaud all the spiritual universalism, all the scientific freedom that a Church as a unity of faith can allow in itself, without, with an evident self-contradiction, proclaiming itself a community in truth-abolished, a false and lying community. Those both learned and lay who cannot confine themselves within this necessary restriction, cannot by any manner of means be Christians, and so must lay aside the name of Christian, in place of which we grant them any other, even the most glittering, they chose to give themselves. Will they be called Protestants ! Well then, indeed, they may, and we renounce any claim to that name which undeniably suits them best, who have nothing else definite in common but to protest against the Christian Church

and against every community of faith which will confess its faith and stand by its confession. Will they be called Rationalists! Well then, though we certainly cannot renounce reason, either as it is in God or as it is in his image in us, we have nothing to boast of and therefore willingly grant to our opponents this arrogant name, just as the Fathers of the Church without binding themselves to stupidity, conceded the name of Gnostics to their opponents. Will they finally with unbelievable humility be called Lutherans, well then, in the Church we will not dispute it with them; for we are not baptised into Luther's name, and our fathers taught us, not that Luther, but that Christ was crucified for us; but in the School we must defend this our father in Christ, and demonstrate that all Protestants against the historic Christian Church who appeal for his support either stagger in a dreadful historical darkness, or else proceed by falsehood, and in either case dishonour the blessed memory of that wonderful man, and in either case misuse his name, rightly famous throughout Christendom, to adorn what he detested from the bottom of his heart.'

'For it is certain that whatever the Reformers and Martin Luther their great leader, in their struggle with the Papacy, maintained as *theologians* about the scripture as the rule of faith, yet as priests and teachers in the Church they presupposed both Church and Faith constantly, and were united on the fact that Scripture cannot be rightly understood except with the aid of the Holy Spirit, that is by believing Christians, and that therefore they could not possibly derive faith from Scripture, before they understood it. It is also certain that our Communion, in the Augsburg Confession, which Luther and Melancthon would certainly not have protested against, bound its teachers to the Apostolic confession of faith (Article III), and to the one, true, historic-Christian unchangeable catholic Church.' (Articles VII and XXI).⁴

What has been quoted will be sufficient to show something of the interest of this fascinating document. Parallels with contemporary or slightly later developments in Anglicanism are not lacking. In his rejection of a Biblicist or individualist conception of Christianity, Grundtvig is at one with the leaders of the Oxford Movement, as he is in his appeal to the witness of the apostolic writings and to the whole of the Church's history. While in his declaration that the Church is to be known and recognised by the

⁴ Op. cit., pp. 98-101.

Apostolic Creed and in the Sacraments, there is a most interesting similarity with the thought of F. D. Maurice. However differently Grundtvig's thought developed from that of the Tractarians, it seems of vital importance to recognise their common starting point. And surely it is a fact of no little significance for us to-day. For it would seem to provide for Lutherans one of the most notable ways available to them, of opening up their own tradition to meet the whole tradition of Catholic Christendom, while for those who are not Lutherans it would seem to provide a real way in to the understanding of their otherwise rather inaccessible and difficult tradition.

In the light of what has so far been written, it will easily become apparent that the writing of hymns acquired for Grundtvig an unrivalled importance. If the Church becomes itself, or rather is created by God, through the sacraments and the liturgical confession of faith, then it at once becomes necessary that the congregation should have hymns in which to express this reality, hymns to use for the celebration of the sacraments. For this purpose the individualistic piety of the eighteenth-century Danish hymn book was quite unsuitable, and Grundtvig set about the preparation of a new hymn book. At first he thought merely of adapting the classical hymns of sixteenth and seventeenth century Lutheran authors. But very soon he found himself embarked on a wider task, and in the spirit of *Kirkens Gienmaele* set about the attempt of gathering up into one extracts from the whole course of Christian hymnody and making them available to the Danish public.

Writing in 1837 to his friend Ingemann, in a letter accompanying a copy of his *Sang Vaerk* (his collection of hymns) he says 'What specially pleases me is the bringing together of notes from all the chief periods of the universal Church, which in the preparation came to my ears and moved my heart; and though I know well enough that the different notes have lost something of their own character in passing through me, yet I dare to hope that there are signs still there which will bring joy to faithful hearts as a foretaste of the new song, with which all tongues and languages praise Him, of whom and for whom all things are.'⁸

In this passage Grundtvig frankly recognises the problem of the possibility of transferring hymns from one language to another,

⁸ Quoted by Jorgen Elbeck in his article on 'Grundtvig and the Latin Hymns' in *Grundtvig-Studier*, 1939, p. 11.

from one thought-world to another.* How far was it possible for him, in so many ways a child of his own time with the equipment of a romantic poet to make a translation of St John of Damascus, or Adam of St Victor? We have here a most important question, not only for the study of Grundtvig, but indeed for the understanding of the whole history of the Church and one which must occupy our attention in the second part of this article. When we reflect that the words of our Lord himself had undergone a process of translation before ever they were written down, or when we consider the problems of adaptation which face the Church in her mission to-day, whether among the de-Christianised masses of Europe, or the non-Christian cultures of the East, we may well feel that the gift of tongues at Pentecost was not least the gift of interpretation and translation.

In the case of Grundtvig studies the question is crucial, because many of those who write about Grundtvig in Denmark seem to stress the reality of the particular and individual in his writings, almost to the exclusion of the universal. There is a tendency to say that because the hymns are Danish through and through, and without question marked by the character of their translator, *therefore* they cannot express any universal truth, but must be merely national and individual in value. This tension is clearly to be seen in the two studies of Mr Jorgen Elbeck on Grundtvig's translations from Latin and Greek; and not unnaturally Elbeck in his careful analysis of the stylistic and thematic relations of the translations to their originals leans towards the point of view which sees dissimilarity rather than agreement between them. But as I shall try to point out the real question is at basis not a literary but a theological one. It is when we are most truly ourselves, that we are most fully at one with our fellow men. In the miracle of the Holy Spirit, the one Faith, the one Gospel finds expression in every tongue, in every idiom, so that the antithesis between particular and universal is overcome.

* A few years later Benjamin Webb wrote to his friend J. M. Neale, when the latter was commencing his work of translation, 'I don't believe that we can have hymns in the vernacular. I don't believe that we subjective men can write hymns which must be altogether objective. . . . I, too, have thought many years on this subject, and am more and more convinced that the age of hymns has passed. . . . ppy those who can use the ancient Latin ones: with our vernacular we have lost our privilege.' (*Letters of J. M. Neale*, 1910, pp. 126-7.)

It is of course true that Grundtvig's translations are usually very free and are often more in the nature of paraphrases than translations. It is also undeniable that at times he fails to understand the point of his original, or brings into his translation some other theme than that on which the original concentrated. But it is also true, that while some of his hymns, or rather religious poems have a very subjective, romantic ring about them, there are others which magnificently embody the congregational, objective quality which characterises the best Christian hymn writing. To understand how this comes about we shall have to examine a little the way in which Grundtvig's style was formed, and to do so will throw interesting light on his understanding of tradition. For while in Lutheran theology, the concept of tradition has little or no place, in Grundtvig's idea of poetry and the development of national life it plays a central role.

For Grundtvig the idea of the nation and its language are inseparably connected; and it is always the spoken language, the 'living word' which concerns him primarily. For him, in his educational and literary theories as well as in his theology, we may say that the written word exists for the sake of the living word whether spoken or sung. Like Wordsworth he had the greatest regard for the speech of 'uneducated' people, especially when it was rich with the proverbs and sayings of the countryside. And this same speech exercised a profound influence on his own writings, and specially on his hymns, which are full of lines which have passed into the common speech of the Danish people.

The fact that Grundtvig's literary style is at least in some respects rooted in the life and tradition of the people, has considerable theological significance. For it is the whole body of the faithful, the holy people of God, who are the guardians of the Christian tradition. And just as in Greece under the Turks, or in Russia to-day, it is the 'grannies' and the Sunday worship of the Church which carry on the tradition at a time when it can find little or no theological expression, so I would suggest in an analogous way, even in Protestantism when many elements of continuity in Church life have been lost, when perhaps there is an imprecise or unbalanced teaching of Christian doctrine, yet in the worship and life of the people something of the great tradition continues. Anyone acquainted with the life of the English Free Churches would, I think, agree that this was so.

And if this is true of English nonconformity, how much more

true it is in the case of a Church like that of Denmark, where the village churches stand virtually unaltered from the Middle Ages, and where so many elements of the worship and life of the pre-reformation Church have been preserved. However poor liturgical life may have been in eighteenth-century Denmark or England, nevertheless it was from it that the Tractarians in England and Grundtvig in Denmark received their vision of a renewal of the Church's life of praise and worship. The great festivals of Christmas, Easter and Whitsun, which recur again and again in Grundtvig's hymns, have retained their place in the Lutheran calendar, and indeed stand out with unrivalled importance on account of the suppression of most other holy days. How much of the memories of his childhood in a country vicarage, with the church bells ringing out from one village to the next can be found in Grundtvig's verses. This is quite specially true of the Whitsun hymns (as for instance in the magnificent 'I al sin glans nu straalær solen'. D.S.B. 247) which are universally acknowledged to be among his best. Lying behind them, there is not only his immediate conviction of the meaning of Pentecost, and the work of the Holy Spirit, but a childhood of memories of the great Whitsun festival, which because spring comes late in Denmark has gathered to itself many of the pre-Christian customs which we associate with May Day. By its connection with the deep, instinctual life of the people Grundtvig's writing acquires not only a Danish, but a universally human quality.

The religious significance of this connection becomes explicit in the figure of Malene Jensdotter, the old maid servant and nurse in his father's vicarage at Udby, who had lived there for forty years so as to become 'a fixture', and who looked after Grundtvig as a child. In his notes to his translations of the Danish medieval chronicles he tells us that often when he was at a loss for a word or an expression, he would ask himself 'How would have Malene have said it?' And in one of his verses the old peasant woman seems to stand almost as a symbol of the tradition of the Church, 'With her heart on her tongue, with her book on her lap, with a longing to sing as the words led her, with working lips in weakness's band, with fluttering hands, in the spirit of the fathers, sang out Magdalene in full clear tones, with tears, the so beautiful hymns.'⁷

⁷ Quoted in an article by Morten Bredsdorff in *Grundtvig Studier*, 1959, p. 68.

In Grundtvig's understanding of the Church and of Christian life, God's Word is heard in Baptism and Eucharist, and it is the common property of all, both learned and unlearned, who receive it in a faithful and true heart, and thereby become members of the family of God.

Here then, in the fact that in his writing he is consciously drawing upon the speech and history of an ancient and Christian people, is one of the reasons why, in at least some of his hymns, Grundtvig is able to create something at once new and yet true to the originals, at once his own and yet a common possession for all Christendom.

For the real question here is a theological one, and one which unfortunately does not seem to be appreciated by some of the many Danish scholars who write about this subject.⁸ It is of the very essence of the Christian mystery that in the Church, the conflict between the particular and the universal is transcended and overcome. In the fellowship of the Holy Spirit, which binds all together into one, each finds the fulfilment of his own particular being, so that, as St Peter Damian says 'that which belongs to all belongs to each, and conversely that which is particular to some is also common to all in the unity of faith and love'.⁹ To enter into the fellowship of Christ and of the Spirit means death to self, but such a death that out of it the true self may be born. And grace, far from destroying human freedom and the uniqueness of each human person in fact fulfils it. It is through the particular times and circumstances of our lives that the Spirit is able to work. Such surely is the teaching of St Paul, and the testimony of the *Acts of the Apostles*. Such too would seem to be the implication of the classical Lutheran principle that the presence of God is given to us, not apart from, but 'in, with and under' the material elements of this world.

To speak otherwise, is to set up a false antithesis, and to fail to see that in this particular instance, it is in those moments when

⁸ It is with great diffidence that one criticises writers who obviously have a deep and detailed knowledge of Grundtvig's life and writings, quite beyond that of any non-Danish student. And yet there are things that can be better seen from a distance, and one cannot disguise a certain feeling of disappointment with some of the Grundtvig writings which seem to assume that their subject is of a merely local interest, superb though they are in their accuracy and care.

⁹ St Peter Damian, *Selected Writings on the Spiritual Life* (trans. P. McNulty), p. 64.

Grundtvig is most true to himself that he is able to express not something purely Danish and nineteenth century, but something which has meaning for every time and place. Certainly there are hymns in which an early nineteenth century literary fashion, romantic and even at times sentimental, seems to have got the upper hand. But there are others, and they are the majority, in which the language and feeling of the Danish writer seems to have been controlled and inspired by the authentic tradition of Christendom; hymns in which we can see a living expression of the truth of his own deepest conviction that the Holy Spirit speaks the one Gospel in every man's mother-tongue, the language that is really his own.

Only in the light of such a theology of the Church, which sees it as a free unity of diverse persons, finding their fulfilment in the recognition of their common nature, a theology of the Church, that is, which sees it as the image upon earth of the Blessed Trinity, can we do full justice both to the richly particular, and to the amazingly universal aspects of Grundtvig's work as a hymn-writer. Only in such a light, I would suggest, shall we see the full meaning of what he wrote, for our own time and for the whole Church.

Having considered the problem of translation in general, we shall now examine in detail a number of Grundtvig's translations from the Greek. There are altogether in the *Sang Vaerk*, some thirty-eight pieces which are founded directly on Greek originals. The translations seem all to have been made in the early months of 1837, and in his admirable study *Grundtvig og de Graeske Salmer*, Elbeck has identified the actual volume, an eighteenth-century Venetian Liturgicon, which Grundtvig borrowed from the Royal Library in January 1837 and subsequently employed. Elbeck shows that in his work Grundtvig reveals a thorough knowledge of the Greek language, but no particular understanding either of the metre or of the thought forms of Byzantine hymnody, a fact which is hardly surprising considering the circumstances of the time. What is surprising is the extent to which he could find congenial themes in the hymns of the Eastern Church, and we shall here consider three of these themes.

First there is the particular attraction which the feminine element in the Orthodox hymns seems to have had for him. He is drawn for instance towards the verses about the myrrh-bearing women at the tomb, and attaches special importance to the fact that it was

women who first greeted the risen Christ. 'And it is woman's glory, that they should first bring to the Apostles news of death's overthrow.'¹⁰ For Grundtvig the myrrh-bearing women are seen as an example of woman's particular vocation, which is to have faith, to hear the word of God and keep it. It is not surprising that one who so greatly admired Irenaeus should have wished to make much of the Eve-Mary typology. Here is his poem based on the anastasion, 'Fresh and beautiful to eat was the fruit which killed me. Christ is the tree of life; when I eat thereof, I do not die; but with the thief I cry, Lord remember me in thy kingdom.' In Grundtvig's hands it is expanded as follows, 'The woman saw your fruit was beautiful,/you tree of knowledge of old time;/of you every son of Adam dies,/ however clever he may be./Deceived by wisdom's glitter,/ she brought death into the world./O Mother, that was evil./The woman believes thy Word is true,/our Saviour from on high./You who have overcome death/will join us to yourself./ She took no heed of Wisdom's glitter,/but brought life into the heart./O Mother, that is wisdom.'¹¹

It is true that Grundtvig seems to shrink from drawing out all the consequences of his thought about the Mother of God. But it is none the less clear that he rejoiced in the ancient typology of the Church, not only in the contrast of Eve and Mary, but also in the identification of the virgin mother with the Church. In a translation from a canon of Kosmas, he writes 'Formerly childless and barren, now a fruitful Mother of Kings, Sion, praise thy bridegroom, and let thy family, God's brothers sing in Baptism; none but thou my Lord art good and clean'.¹² Or again in a verse from a canon for Christmas. 'The whole creation sings with us our evening hymn, the Christmas message to the praise of the child who is the sun's uprising. Mysterious he, born of a virgin, begotten of his Father before the stars were made, come to us now in flesh, is cradled in a lap. Sing praise to God's great mercy.'¹³

Secondly we must notice the way in which Grundtvig takes up the thought of the identification of the heavenly and the earthly worship of the Church. This enthusiastic and realistic sacramentalism, this conviction that it is the Spirit himself who speaks and

¹⁰ Jorgen Elbeck. *Grundtvig og de Graeske Salmer*, 1960, p. 93. For the whole of this section I am deeply indebted to Mr Elbeck's book.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 95.

¹² *Ibid.*, p. 95.

¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 102.

works in the Eucharist of the Christian congregation making Christ present in the joy of his risen life¹⁴ has played a great part in enriching the worship of the Danish parishes, though unfortunately it has not always been so well received by the theologians. It is a characteristic of all Grundtvig's hymns, not only of his translations from the Greek, but we may suppose that his contact with Orthodox sources gave great encouragement and confirmation to the development of his own line of thought. Here is his adaptation of certain of the texts from the Liturgy of the Presanctified during Holy Week. First a literal translation of the Greek. 'Now the hosts of heaven invisibly serve with us. For see, the King of glory enters in; see the mystic, perfect offering is escorted by the heavenly hosts. Let us go forth in faith and longing that we may be made partakers of eternal life. Alleluia, Alleluia, Alleluia.' There follows the Communion Verse. 'O taste and see how gracious the Lord is. I will praise the Lord at all times, his praise shall ever be in my mouth. The bread of heaven and the chalice of life. O, taste and see how gracious the Lord is. Alleluia, Alleluia, Alleluia.' This is what Grundtvig makes of it. 'Angels in hosts/gladly come down/kneel around God's Table with us,/every time in the Word/the high priest enters the sanctuary/and the shepherd offers himself for the sheep./ With us they joyfully cry,/Praise be to God, Alleluia./Faithful souls/oft let us kneel/for the feast on the table/the Lord in his Word,/eat and drink his flesh and his blood./So we can taste that the Lord is good,/and sing with the Angels/Praise be to God, Alleluia./Him shall we praise,/joyful to imitate,/and what we now sing/will always be on our tongues./We all have tasted that the Lord is good,/we have drunk of the river of God's blessedness,/ we with the angels will travel henceforth./Praise be to God, Alleluia.'¹⁵

In these three verses we can see how Grundtvig could take texts which happened to lie together on the same page, and without attempting to reproduce their original form would weld them together for his own purposes. There are at least three points of theology that demand our attention. First, the fact that the angels are described as coming down from heaven and kneeling around

¹⁴ Cf. the verse 'He who grants us life and light/with his Spirit and his Word,/he who binds up all the broken/at his Font and Altar-Board,/ Jesus Christ, midst all our gladness/living comes, is present with us.' D.S.B., 142.

¹⁵ Ibid., p. 33.

the Altar with us, might reasonably be thought a piece of westernism on Grundtvig's part; heaven coming down to earth, rather than we being taken up into the heavenly worship. But Elbeck points out that it happens that on the following page of the Liturgicon there is a troparion for Christ's presentation in the temple which does speak of the angels coming down to earth, and it may be that this had caught Grundtvig's eye and influenced his interpretation here. Secondly, there is the twice repeated phrase 'in the Word', that Christ is present, and offers himself 'in the Word'. Here we have a distinct sign of Lutheran terminology, but it is not I think one of which in this context we need be unduly afraid. For if it is asserted that Christ is present in the Word, it is none the less clear that he is present in the holy gifts for which we are to kneel at the Table. Thirdly there is the fact that Grundtvig specifies much more explicitly than does the original, that when the high priest enters the sanctuary the shepherd offers himself for his flock. The doctrine of the eucharistic sacrifice, which creates such difficulties for Lutheran theology, is here clearly expressed. It is sad that this hymn has not found its way into the official Danish hymn book (in which more than a third of the hymns are either translations or originals of Grundtvig) for one would dearly like to hear it used in worship.

Thirdly we must look for a moment at the way in which Grundtvig takes up the thought of Christ's redemptive work centred on the cross and resurrection as one victorious act, in which we are called to participate. 'O Christ our Saviour, both as God and as Man,/Crucified with thee, buried yesterday/may we even here below/shine with thee in the land of the living./Thou who art rock and support for our heart', as he sings in his version of St John of Damascus' great Easter canon.¹⁶ Here again we have one of Grundtvig's own favourite themes, one of his convictions already established long before 1837, and yet again a belief which must have been deepened and clarified by his work on the Byzantine liturgical texts. A striking example can be found in the translation of two verses, one from Palm Sunday, the other from Monday in Holy Week. Literally rendered, they run, 'Come ye faithful, let us hasten to glorify the saving passion of Christ, our God, his unspeakable long suffering, so that he in his mercy may awaken us who are dead, from sin; for he is good and the

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 35.

lover of man', and 'Buried with thee in Baptism, Christ our God, make us worthy of thine eternal life through thy resurrection, as we sing to thee, Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord'.

This is transformed into one long verse with irregular lines, as follows. 'Faithful souls/come let us devoutly regard/the memory of the Saviour's passion,/to find comfort./We will not weep for the pain and death,/which has yielded us the blessed hope/but we will worship our Saviour and cry,/Thanks for the deep, the holy Baptism/wherein we are crucified, dead and buried/with thee, that from thee we may receive life./Thou who arose from the dead again/Thou lover of men./We glorify thee as our Lord and God,/ blessed for ever, praised be thou,/for that of thy compassion/thou sufferedst death,/and wilt raise us up from the death of sin/grant us heaven/thou who hast died for us that we might live with thee'.¹⁷ As before there is no attempt at a literal translation, but we may truly say that the original subject matter has been more than faithfully reproduced.

One of the finest expressions of this theme is to be found in a hymn which was cited in our earlier article, but which will be quoted again to conclude this introductory study of Grundtvig's work as a hymn-writer. It is an original piece, written at about the time in which Grundtvig was making his Greek translations, and unlike most of the verses quoted in this article it has found its way into the Danish Hymn Book (D.S.B. 372), and is well known among Danish congregations. In the strength and vigour of its lines we hear not only the authentic voice of N. F. S. Grundtvig, but something of the accents of the Fathers, living and speaking in our own times.

Sunday morning from the dead/Jesus rose triumphant./Every Sunday's dawn/now brings healing to death/and wonderfully re-calls/all the days of the Lord's life./

Thousand-tongued the Lord's words,/now are reborn throughout the world,/Wake now from sleep and sloth/every ear that can hear./Arise soul from the dead/and greet the dawn of Easter.// Every Sunday death shudders,/darkness trembles beneath the earth,/for with glory where Christ gives light/the word of life has giant-tones;/and victoriously overcomes,/the prince of death and the kingdom of darkness.

A. M. ALLCHIN,
Oxford.

¹⁷ Ibid., p. 81.

NEWS AND COMMENT

ROME AND THE ECUMENICAL COUNCIL

ON the 13th November 1960, Pope John XXIII presided at a Slavonic Liturgy in the Basilica of St Peter's. It was only the fourth time since the beginning of this century that a Pope had presided at Mass in the Byzantine rite. During his sermon, the Pope reminded those present that

'the fact of taking part in rites in different languages, and with different histories, in the adoration of the Holy Trinity, is a first and solemn manifestation of respect for the unity of that divine institution which is the Church'.

On the following day, the 14th November, the Pope opened the directly preparatory phase of the Council with a discourse in Italian. Continental commentators¹ have been quick to note this use of the vernacular on such an occasion as significant, regarding it as a tacit recognition that Latin can now no longer be regarded as a truly universal language.

On both these occasions, the Pope spoke of the objects of the coming Council, and gave it to be understood that specifically dogmatic issues were likely to remain in the background. The Council's task, he said on the 13th November, will be to 'give back to the face of the Church the splendour of the simpler and purer form of the time of her birth'. On the next day, the Holy Father asked 'our brethren, who are truly worthy of respect even though they are, as it is commonly said, separated' to be patient and to wait until the work of the Commissions has been completed before expecting to receive more detailed information about the Council, and he encouraged them to seek this information in due course through the Secretariat which has been specially set up for this purpose. He also said, according to the *Osservatore Romano*, that he had been gratified by 'the respectful attention given by our separated brethren' to the announcement of the Council, for 'it is like a joyful foretaste of the unity of all those who believe in Jesus Christ'.

On the 25th November, in a discourse to the clergy of Rome on the occasion of the entry into force of the decisions of the Roman Diocesan Synod, the Pope made some further observations

¹ For example, Fr R. Rouquette, S.J., writing in *Etudes*, January 1961, p. 107.

of considerable ecumenical significance. He gave first of all two warnings: one against the excesses of certain forms of devotion to our Lady and the Saints, 'by which our people gives an impoverished image of its religiosity'; and the other against a tendency among the clergy to ambition and careerism. This, the Pope said, is difficult to reconcile with the ideal of 'following Christ'; and he went on: 'On this point, please allow your bishop and father to express a complaint which goes deeply to his heart, and which often causes him to groan in prayer'. Thirdly, and no doubt more important than these warnings against human frailty, is the Pope's exhortation to all to read and to meditate the Holy Scriptures, 'of which', he said, 'the ignorance is nowadays truly impardonable for every self-respecting Catholic'.

It seems to us that this discourse gives a remarkable insight into the Pope's sensitive and deeply pastoral soul, and that, in choosing these particular points as those in connection with which he especially hopes the reform of his own diocese to bear fruit, he has given an encouraging sign of the truly 'ecumenical' significance of the coming reform of the whole Church in the Second Vatican Council.

SOME OTHER IMPORTANT DECLARATIONS

The change in atmosphere which the many initiatives of Pope John XXIII in favour of better relations between separated Christians have brought about, has been admirably described by H.E. Cardinal Pizzardo, Prefect of the Congregation of Seminaries and Universities, in a conference which concluded a study-week on the Council which was held at the Lateran University in November:

'John XXIII', said His Eminence, 'is inviting his sons, and in them all the sons of God, to an *ecumenical encounter in love*. The controversies of an earlier day being now outdated, the Pope knows and feels that if truth and charity are united essentially in God, they ought also to be united by virtue in man.'²

Cardinal Bea, President of the Secretariat for Christian Unity, has on his side published a remarkable article which is intended to be translated into many languages, and in which he comments on the intention of the *Apostolate of Prayer* for January 1961, which was 'The overcoming of the obstacles to Christian Unity'.

² *Osservatore Romano*, 21st—23rd November 1960.

The Cardinal writes that these obstacles should not be exaggerated : the truth is grave enough. And he goes on :

'Neither must we seek to overlook the very great good which is to be found among our separated brethren, and still less make ourselves the judges of their responsibilities, either in regard to the historical facts of the separations, or as concerns personal situations. The facts of history are too complex to be the object of a purely human judgement. God alone can unravel the threads of this tangled historical skein.'

He then goes on to deplore the lack of charity of many Catholics :

'We do not go as far as hatred, but we do allow ourselves to fall into indifference and insensitivity. We must, on the contrary, not only in words but in reality, consider our separated brethren as brethren, according to the admirable phrase of St Augustine which the Holy Father has recalled in his Encyclical *Ad Petri cathedram* : "Whether they will it or not, they are our brethren. They will only have ceased to be so when they no longer say : 'Our Father . . .'"'

Speaking at Arnoldsheim, in Germany, on the significance of the Second Vatican Council, Mgr J. G. M. Willebrands, Secretary of the Christian Unity Secretariat, has said that the restoration of Christian Unity must of necessity be a new and gradual historical process, and not simply a return to the unity of the past.

He said that it was a concern for Christian Unity which had led Pope John XXIII to call the Council ; but added that it was neither possible nor desirable at present for the Catholic Church to become an official member of the World Council of Churches, since there was need first for a long period of unofficial relationships.*

OTHER NEWS FROM ROME

It has been announced that a special Press Office will be created at the Vatican to keep the public informed of the preparations for the Council. One of its main tasks will be to forestall the spreading of false information about these preparations.

* * * *

On 6th January, for the first time, an address by a Protestant theologian was broadcast by Radio Vatican.

* Ecumenical Press Service.

The address was delivered in German by Professor Peter Meinhold, Professor of Church History and Dogma at the University of Kiel. Speaking on the topic 'Meetings between Churches in Love and Truth', Professor Meinhold stressed the need 'to seek in love for the expression of truth which has been entrusted to the Christian in the Gospel . . . which all the Churches are convinced that they possess'.

The Lordship of Christ must be proclaimed and made manifest to the world through the fellowship of all Christians as members of the body of Jesus Christ, he stressed.³

GREAT BRITAIN

ECUMENICAL JOURNEY OF THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY

The journey of Dr Fisher, Archbishop of Canterbury and senior Prelate of the Anglican Communion, to Jerusalem, Constantinople and Rome during the early part of December, of which many of our readers will have read the details in the press, has aroused widespread interest and comment. The journey, and in particular the visits to the Ecumenical Patriarch and to Pope John XXIII which were its highlights, undoubtedly 'captured the imagination of the Christian world'⁴ and, whatever its 'diplomatic' significance, has undoubtedly done much psychologically to change interconfessional relationships for the better, not least in Great Britain. At least two members of the Catholic hierarchy have commented that the Pope's example in being so ready to meet leaders of other confessions informally, might well be followed by the clergy at the parochial level.

At Jerusalem, when the Archbishop visited the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, 'he was met by a host of clergy who escorted him to the candle-lit altar, where he kissed a relic of the Passion and knelt before the Tabernacle. An Armenian Bishop held his right hand and the Franciscan Superior, his left. Later, in procession with the Orthodox, Armenian and Latin Patriarchs, he was escorted on a walk through the city up the Via Dolorosa preceded by footmen who crashed their staves on the pavement to clear the way.'

³ Ecumenical Press Service.

⁴ E.P.S., 2nd December 1960.

In his sermon on the Sunday at the Anglican Cathedral, Dr Fisher said that there was blowing through the Churches 'a great wind, a wind of fellowship in Christ, a wind of the Holy Spirit'. 'In many parts of the world and in contact with many Churches I have felt that a resurrection is at work', he said. 'I pray that my journey . . . may in some measure give help and encouragement to all who find in the ecumenical movement an authentic voice of the Holy Spirit to the Churches of the world.'⁴

We give in full the account given by the Ecumenical Press Service (9th December 1960) of the Archbishop's visits to Constantinople and to Rome:

'The Most Rev. Geoffrey Francis Fisher, the Archbishop of Canterbury, has called upon Pope John XXIII.

The meeting was quiet and with no outward fuss and the barest minimum of ceremony.

It took fifty-five minutes and what words passed between the two Christian leaders may never be revealed. They were alone except for an interpreter and even photographers were barred from recording the historic meeting.

Statements issued following the meeting on behalf of both the Pope and the Archbishop discussed it in the mildest of terms. All sources emphasized the cordiality of the meeting and agreed that there was no discussion of negotiations concerning Church union.

The statement by the Archbishop said the Pope had 'expressed his great desire . . . to increase brotherly feelings among all men, especially among all Christians, and the Archbishop confirmed out of his knowledge and experience how keen and widespread was the desire in many Churches to act for the same purpose'.

It said it 'was never intended that this should be an occasion for consideration of particular problems or issues, and the meeting retained throughout the character of a visit of courtesy. It was marked by a happy spirit of cordiality and sympathy, such as befitted a notable event in the history of Church relations.'

The Archbishop later told reporters that he had greeted the Pontiff with the words, 'Your Holiness, we are making history', and the Pope had agreed.

Later, the Pope is said to have told Cardinals and prelates in the Vatican that 'we remained at the threshold of the great

problems'. The official Vatican communiqué related that the Archbishop was received 'graciously by the Supreme Pontiff who engaged him for nearly an hour' and that 'the Holy Father interested himself particularly in the recent journey of the illustrious visitor in various nations of the Orient . . .' It said also that 'the conversations, always characterized by sentiments of sympathy, turned also to personal memories of a spiritual nature'.

Particular importance was credited to the meeting of the Archbishop with Augustin Cardinal Bea, head of the Secretariat on Christian Unity for the Vatican Council.

During this visit it was reportedly agreed that an immediate liaison should be set up between the Secretariat and Lambeth Palace (the headquarters of the Anglican Communion) to facilitate the free flow of information in both directions.

Dr Fisher is said to have told Cardinal Bea that he considered the Secretariat 'a very useful organ' and made clear that he would be glad to give assistance and would be pleased to know of any ways in which help could be offered in its work.

Earlier the Archbishop preached the third of three sermons delivered during his unprecedented twelve day tour. Addressing a large congregation at Evensong in All Saints' Anglican Church, he said of his visit, 'This could only happen, I could only have suggested my visit here, because the Pope on his side made it clear he would receive me in a similar spirit in the courtesy of Christian brotherhood.'

'Here is indeed a day of the Lord, like many days of the Lord, simple, unspectacular, hardly to be observed, a whisper of the still small voice of the Holy Spirit.'

Continuing, the Archbishop outlined what some observers termed his plan for 'a commonwealth of all Churches'. Unity, not union is the keyword now, he stressed, 'for Church union or reunion rests above reconciliation of jurisdiction and authorities so that within the one Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church the particular Churches of Christendom may be duly related to one another in terms of co-ordination and full community. But unity is of the Spirit and into that unity of discipleship and mutual love the Churches can enter already and are entering now.'

For two days preceding his visit to Rome the Archbishop was in Istanbul as the guest of His All Holiness, Athenagoras, the Œcumenical Patriarch of Constantinople and as 'first among equals' the spiritual leader of the Eastern Orthodox Church.

It also was a visit notable for its cordiality and warmth. On his arrival the Archbishop was driven straight from the airport to the Church of the Phanar, the See of the Œcumenical Patriarch where His Holiness celebrated the Liturgy and offered prayers for the unity of all Churches.

Later the two Primates had discussions in the Patriarch's study, which reportedly dealt with the possibilities of a 'confederation of Christian Churches'. By this it was understood to mean confederal relationship of all Churches, regardless of their doctrinal differences.

The Patriarch was said to have praised the work of the World Council of Churches, but to have told the Archbishop that it should be enlarged to include Roman Catholics. Referring to the Second Vatican (Ecumenical) Council called by Pope John XXIII, the Patriarch said that he was willing to go anywhere for the cause of unity and would visit Rome on the condition that he be received as an 'equal'.

The two confessional leaders also reportedly agreed to a resumption of theological talks with representatives including the whole Orthodox Church, and not just the Greek Orthodox segment, as before. This was understood to be contingent upon a consultation with heads of the autocephalous Churches to be held at a Pan-Orthodox synod in Rhodes.

On Saturday, Dr Fisher, fresh from his visit in Rome, arrived home in London. He told reporters who met him at the airport he was confident the way was now clear for friendlier relations between the Anglicans and Orthodox and Catholics. 'For more has been accomplished than I ever expected', he declared.

Cardinal Bea, President of the Secretariat for Christian Unity, has described the visit to the Pope as 'extremely important'. 'There are things which were inconceivable a few decades ago and which are proof of a considerable change in atmosphere', he continued. 'We venture to believe that the atmosphere will be still more improved by the visit. That is the essential point.'⁵

Radio Vatican listed the visit as one of the major religious events of 1960. It said the visit was 'an example of charity without prejudicing immutable principles', and 'a very good example to all Christians.'⁶

⁵ E.P.S.

RETIREMENT OF THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY AND
APPOINTMENT OF HIS SUCCESSOR

The following announcement appeared in the *Times* of the 18th January 1961 :

'The Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr Geoffrey Fisher, announced yesterday that he had tendered his resignation to the Queen and would vacate his See and Archbishopric on 31st May. He has been Archbishop since 1945.

Dr Fisher, who will be 74 on 5th May, will be made a life Peer.

Dr Fisher gave the news of his resignation at the Convocation of Canterbury at Church House, Westminster, when he opened the proceedings with his presidential address. Giving reasons why this was "just the right moment" for him to hand over, he said he regarded it as essential to make it possible for his successor to be present, without undue hurry, at the Third General Assembly of the World Council of Churches in New Delhi from 18th November to 6th December.

Later in the proceedings Dr Fisher said : "My vigour has not declined ; I am convinced that day to day my wisdom increases ; I am also satisfied my stock of patience diminishes, and that is why I think that the time has come".

On the same day, His Eminence Cardinal Godfrey issued the following statement :

'The approaching retirement of the Archbishop of Canterbury after long years of leadership of the Established Church and the Anglican Communion will remind many of his devoted services to our nation, of his patriotism and of his sincere desire and endeavour to promote and foster the union of Christendom. This desire is shared by many who are not of his faith and, not least, by Catholics everywhere.

The recent visit of his Grace to Pope John was a gesture which we all greatly appreciate. We hope and pray with the Archbishop that it may bear fruit, that any misunderstandings may be removed and that no element of bitterness may disturb concord among those who seek to follow Christ. We pray that his Grace may have health and happiness in the years of retirement. May they be many and greatly blessed.'

It has been announced that Dr Fisher will be succeeded by Dr Arthur Michael Ramsey, 56-year-old Archbishop of York. He

will be the 100th Archbishop of Canterbury, and will be succeeded at York by the Bishop of Bradford, Dr Coggan.

A brilliant theologian—perhaps his best-known work is *The Gospel and the Catholic Church*—Dr Ramsey is well known for his interest in the Ecumenical Movement and particularly in the Eastern Churches. He is President of the Fellowship of St Alban and St Sergius.

Dr Ramsey will be enthroned at Canterbury on 27th June.

Writing in *The York Quarterly* recently, Dr Ramsey has called attention to the danger of slipping into 'theological woolliness' in our search for Christian Unity. In regard to the Anglican position he writes:

'Now is the time for a renewed assertion of the historic Anglican appeal to Scripture and antiquity in our dealings alike with Rome, with the Orthodox and with the other communions', he said. 'Into every channel which the increase of charity opens up there must be brought, for the sake of all, not only a readiness to learn, but a steadfast witness to the truth as we have received it.

'To Rome we bring the claim of a Catholic antiquity, from which it is Rome who has in part deviated', he continued. 'To the Orthodox we bring the appeal to patristic ecumenical faith (the faith of the early Church Fathers) which we strive to share with them in non-papal catholicity. To others we bring our gratitude for the open Bible and for the evangelical truths we share with them, together with our own deep conviction of what the continuity of the Catholic Church demands.'^{*}

THE ANGLICAN CHURCH AND THE SECOND VATICAN COUNCIL

Canon Bernard Clinton Pawley, Treasurer of Ely Cathedral and a Proctor in the Convocation of Canterbury, has been appointed by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York as their personal liaison to Rome during preparations for the forthcoming Second Vatican Council.

Canon Pawley will thus serve as a link between the Church of England's Council on Inter-Church Relations and the Catholic Secretariat for Christian Unity, of which the President is Cardinal Bea.

Canon Pawley is a member of the Church Union's Faith and Unity Committee. Dissatisfaction has been expressed in some

^{*} E.P.S., 3rd March 1961.

Anglican quarters that one who would thus appear to represent the 'Anglo-Catholic' wing of the Church should have been chosen for this post.

REVIVAL OF THE SOCIETY OF ST JOHN CHRYSOSTOM

Shortly before his death in 1959, Dom Bede Winslow took an active part in the revival of the Society of St John Chrysostom, with which he had been associated since it was first founded in 1926. The Society's central aim is to promote study and prayer for Christian Unity, especially in relation to the Eastern Churches. There is a quarterly bulletin entitled *Chrysostom*, which can be obtained (together with further information about the Society's work and meetings) from Marian House, Holden Avenue, London, N.12.

EASTERN CHURCHES WEEK-END AT SPODE HOUSE

An 'Eastern Churches Week-end' will be held at Spode House from 2nd—4th June this year. The purpose of the Week-end is to offer to those who may be interested the possibility of going further into various questions concerning the Eastern Churches and the problems of Christian Unity in the context of the coming Ecumenical Council. His Excellency Bishop Ceslaus Sipovitch, M.I.C., has graciously consented to be present and to celebrate the Holy Liturgy. Speakers will include the Very Rev. Fr Henry St John, O.P., Provincial of the English Dominicans, and author of *Essays in Christian Unity*; Fr Bernard Leeming, S.J., author of *The Churches and the Church*; Mlle Irène Posnoff, Director of 'Foyer Oriental Chrétien Pro Russia' in Brussels; Fr Charles Napier, Assistant Editor of the *E.C.Q.*, and Mr Keith Murray.

Applications from those wishing to attend the Week-end should be sent to the Rev. Fr Conrad Pepler, O.P., Spode House, Hawkesyard Priory, Rugeley, Staffs, from whom also further information may be obtained.

IRISH REPUBLIC

MAYNOOTH UNION SUMMER SCHOOL, 1961

The Maynooth Union will hold its fourth Summer School at Saint Patrick's College, Maynooth, from Monday, 26th to Thursday, 29th June 1961.

The theme is 'Christian Unity'. Bishop Wright of Pittsburg will describe the Catholic Church's attitude to ecumenism, Canon Hamell of Maynooth will lecture on the Ecumenical Movement outside the Catholic Church and Father McNamara of Maynooth will speak on the theological foundation of the Church unity movement. The programme includes papers on the three main bodies of separated Christians: Monsignor Joseph Hoefer, member of the Secretariat for Reunion, on Protestantism, Father Francis Clark, S.J., of Heythrop, on Anglicanism and Father Pól O. Súilleabháin, O.F.M., University College, Galway, on the Eastern Churches.

Further papers will deal with particular problems: Father Bernard Leeming, S.J., of Heythrop, will speak on 'The Roman Primacy'; Monsignor Hoefer on 'The Word of God'; Father Francis Clark, S.J., on 'The Mass', and Father Enda McDonagh of Maynooth, on 'Religious Freedom'. A Symposium on 'Catholic-Protestant Relations in Ireland' will be introduced by Monsignor Arthur Ryan, Belfast.

Applications should be made to The Secretary, Maynooth Union Summer School, Maynooth.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

THE EASTERN RITE IN ENGLISH

By a letter of 31st March 1960, addressed to the Melchite Patriarch of Antioch, His Holiness Pope John XXIII has annulled a decision of the Holy Office forbidding the use of the vernacular—and in particular of English—in the celebration of the Mass in the Oriental Rite, a decision which had been communicated to the Bishops of the United States by the Apostolic Delegate. According to *Herder-Korrespondenz*, the Pope took this rare step of reversing a decision of the Holy Office—of which he is himself the Prefect—because the latter was not in fact competent in the matter, which was within the sphere of the Congregation for the Eastern Churches. As the French review *Etudes* comments, the case is reassuring for all those who care for the rights and legitimate autonomy of the Catholic Eastern Churches.

THE ORTHODOX CHURCH IN AMERICA

Archbishop Iakovos of New York, head of the Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of North and South America, and a President of the World Council of Churches, has been named Chairman of the Standing Conference of Canonical Orthodox Bishops in the Americas.

Named as Vice-Chairman was Metropolitan Anthony Bashir, of New York, head of the Syrian Antiochian Orthodox Church. The conference was formed last June to strengthen unity among Orthodox Churches and resolve problems of common concern.

On the occasion of the Sunday of Orthodoxy, celebrated this year on 26th February, Archbishop Iakovos issued a pastoral letter to all his clergy in which he stressed the need for prayer 'for the stability and welfare of the Holy Churches of God and for the union of all'. After quoting these words of the Holy Liturgy, he went on :

'We are children of the great Church of Christ. We shall not refuse to participate in ecumenical dialogues. We shall not be guilty of exclusiveness or isolationism. We shall always be faithful to our Orthodoxy, while being faithful to the brotherly relations which we must have with other Churches. We shall follow the example of our Church, of Christ, who manifested the true God to all.'

THE SOVIET UNION

A RUSSIAN ORTHODOX COMMISSION FOR INTER-CHURCH RELATIONS

The Patriarch Alexis of Moscow has set up a new Commission to deal with relations with other Church bodies.

The Chairman of the Commission is Metropolitan Pitirim of Leningrad and Lagoda, and its members include Bishop Nikodim of Podolsk, President of the Foreign Department of the Church, Bishop Pimen of Dimitrov, Administrator of the Moscow Patriarchate ; Bishop John of Berlin-Karlsorst, Exarch of Central Europe ; Archpriest W. M. Borovoy, representing the President of the Foreign Department ; Archpriest K. I. Rushizki, Dean of the Moscow Theological Academy ; and Professor N. D. Uspensky, of the Leningrad Theological Faculty.

Bishop Nikodim said recently in Damascus that the Russian Church 'favours any movement or gesture aimed at bringing about *rapprochement* or union among the various Christian Churches, but it does not consider that this aim can be achieved unless Pope John XXIII states in advance his agreement to deal with this matter on an equal footing with leaders of other Christian Churches'.

JOURNEY OF THE PATRIARCH ALEXIS OF MOSCOW

The Patriarch Alexis of Moscow made a tour of the Middle and Near East, in the company of sixteen other dignitaries, during the month of December last year.

He visited Alexandria, Damascus (see below under 'Arab Countries' for the reactions of the Catholic Melchite Patriarchate to this visit); Jerusalem, Athens and Constantinople, and in each place had talks with the members of the Orthodox hierarchies.

During the Patriarch's visit to Alexandria, he invited the Coptic Patriarch, His Holiness Kyrillos VI, to visit Moscow in 1961. The Greek Orthodox Patriarch of Alexandria has also announced that he has accepted an invitation given by the Patriarch Alexis during his visit to go to Moscow. He said that he expected that 'Orthodoxy would benefit greatly' from such a meeting.'

In his New Year Message, published soon after his return, the Patriarch said that 'All Christians and all Church leaders, mindful of Christ's commandment, must support decisively the desire for peace and the peace partisans movement'.

He said that his tour gave grounds for hoping that 'the personal contacts established will not only promote a further strengthening of the ties between the Churches, but of the cause of peace which is desired by all peoples on earth'.

THE OLD BELIEVERS

Archbishop Flavian, head of the Russian Old Believers, has died at the age of 82. He has been buried in the crypt of the Old Believers' Cathedral in Moscow, which is famous for its valuable collection of icons.

On the 8th February, Mgr Iossif, Old Believer Bishop of Kichinev and Odessa, was elected as the new Archbishop.

Estimates as to the number of Old Believers in Russia vary between fourteen to twenty millions. Their Church—recognised equally by the Soviet authorities with the Patriarchal Church—is the result of a schism which occurred at the Synod of Moscow in 1664. A section of the clergy and faithful refused to accept the reforms in the ceremonies and liturgical books introduced by the Patriarch Nikon, and they were eventually excommunicated by the Council of Moscow in 1666. Avvakum was the most famous defender of their position.

ARAB COUNTRIES

HIS BEATITUDE MAXIMOS IV ON THE VOCATION OF THE CATHOLIC EASTERN CHURCHES

On the 9th August 1960, at Düsseldorf, during his stay in Germany on the occasion of the Munich Eucharistic Congress, His Beatitude Maximos IV, Catholic Melchite Patriarch of Antioch and of All the East, gave an important conference about the significance and rôle of the Catholic Eastern Churches, of which we here summarize the main points.⁸

There are some who are inclined to consider the existence of these Churches as an obstacle to Unity; the Patriarch, on the contrary, would maintain that they are 'a powerful and indispensable factor in favour of Christian Unity'. They have to face many difficulties in fulfilling this vocation, for they have to maintain themselves 'in a double and equal fidelity to Catholicism and to the East'.

The attitude of Western Catholics to their Oriental brethren is not always adequate. Despite the vast progress that has been achieved, there is still all too much ignorance, and as a result suspicion: too many Western Catholics still appear almost to regret that these Orientals 'are not yet *quite entirely Catholics*, in other words, Latins'.

For the Orthodox who are still separated from Rome, Oriental Catholics can easily appear as spies, even as 'ravening wolves disguised as sheep . . . prime agents of Roman proselytism'.

⁸ Cf. *Etudes*, January 1961, pp. 117-18. Full text in *Vers l'Unité chrétienne*, September-October 1960, pp. 49-54.

But it is not what people think of us that matters, declared the Patriarch. In reality, 'despite our small number, we are conscious of being entrusted with a great mission'.

For the realisation of this mission, the Oriental Catholics possess precious and unique advantages. They have an intense awareness of the great tragedy of division, which causes them to suffer continually in their whole being. They are also closely linked to their Orthodox brethren, for they are of 'the same race, the same language, the same mentality, the same liturgy', to the point that reunion would be for them but a family reconciliation.

And they have above all their 'fidelity to the East', which goes far beyond the mere domain of rites, and obliges them to do all they can to safeguard 'their own inheritance, their canonical institutions, and their traditional organisation'. His Beatitude is not afraid to be precise in this vital matter, which indeed must concern deeply all those who long for the full manifestation of the Church's catholicity :

'To quote only the example', he says, 'of the recent codification of Oriental Canon Law which has been made at Rome, it must be regretfully said that despite an impressive critical apparatus and a terminology which is inspired from Oriental sources, despite also the very meritorious amount of work which has been done, the codification remains at bottom unfortunately very latinising. This is not altogether the fault of the technicians who have worked on it, but rather of the spirit which reigns in the *milieu* in which this work has been done. The great ideal of this *milieu* continues to be the greatest possible identity, in content and in form, with the law of the Latin Church. The institutions which are proper to the East, such as the Patriarchal institution for example, are tolerated as an exception, and are reduced to the strictest possible limits, if they are not adroitly emptied of their meaning and practically neutralised by the effect of an exaggerated administrative centralisation.'

His Beatitude concluded by saying that :

'Our mission is thus a double one. Within the Catholic Church, we need to strive that Latinism and Catholicism may no longer be synonymous, that Catholicism may remain open to every culture and national genius, to every form of organisation which is compatible with unity in faith and love.

At the same time we must, by our example, bring the Orthodox to see that it is possible to be united to the great Church of the West, to the Chair of Peter, without having to renounce Orthodoxy or any part of the spiritual riches of the East, which remains apostolic and patristic, open to the future as to the past.

If we are faithful to this mission, we may eventually arrive at a form of union which will be acceptable to both East and West: neither pure autocephaly, nor absorption in fact or in law, but a real communion in the same faith, the same sacraments, the same organic hierarchy; with a sincere respect for the whole of the spiritual inheritance and specific organisation of each Church, under the vigilance, at once paternal and fraternal, of the successor of him to whom it was said: "Thou art Peter, and upon this Rock I will build my Church".

THE ABSTENTION OF CATHOLICS FROM THE CEREMONIES IN HONOUR OF THE PATRIARCH ALEXIS OF MOSCOW

The abstention of the Melchite Catholic Patriarchate of Antioch and of its faithful from the celebrations organised by the Greek Orthodox Patriarchate of Antioch on the occasion of the visit to Damascus, at the beginning of December last year, of the Patriarch Alexis of Moscow caused a certain amount of not always well-informed comment in some quarters. The Patriarchal Auxiliary, Mgr Pierre-K. Medawar, has given the true reasons for this abstention in the December number of *Al-Masarrat*, the review of the Melchite Patriarchate.

Emphasizing that the Patriarchate does not normally take up this kind of attitude, Mgr Medawar explains that in this case it was inevitable because of the situation of the eight millions of the faithful of the Catholic Eastern Churches in the countries which are under Soviet control, and in particular in the Ukraine, Bielorussia, Czechoslovakia, Roumania, etc.

'The Patriarch Alexis', he writes, 'has worked constantly and continues to work for the realisation of his government's wishes in obliging these Catholics to enter the Orthodox Church by force. In order to arrive at this end, all possible means have been employed.'

'Moreover', he continues, 'the Patriarch Alexis loses no opportunity, in particular on the occasion of meetings of Orthodox

Church leaders at Moscow, of publicly addressing the basest accusations against the Roman Pontiff, calling him an agent of imperialism and of capitalism, accusing him of working for the suppression of liberties and lancing other accusations of this kind which are unworthy of the head of a Christian Church.'

'In face of these regrettable facts, is it fitting that we, as head of Eastern Catholic communities, should take part in ceremonies organised in our country in honour of him who represents in the eyes of the world the unjust régime which insults and persecutes us, puts our bishops in prison and disperses our faithful, and unjustly confiscates our churches and our institutions?'

It will be said that the Patriarch is acting in spite of himself, that he is not free in his actions . . . Certainly, we do not presume to judge him as a man. But the fact remains that outwardly, and in the eyes of the world, he represents these injustices, and the Church in whose favour they have been committed, with or without its consent, and without its showing the slightest qualm.'

Mgr Medawar emphasizes that the visit of the Patriarch Alexis was not a chance occurrence, something secret or of no importance, but that it has aroused the attention of everybody in the Christian world.

'What would these people think', he asks, 'if they were to see us giving honour to the Patriarch who, willingly or not, represents the injustice and persecutions from which we are suffering? . . . Can we forget the lot of our fathers and brethren who have been killed, imprisoned or exiled? Can we forget the suppression of our Churches, the judicial and violent destruction of our communities, and go and receive the representative—however unwilling—of the régime which treats us in this manner? We should be lacking in every kind of feeling if we were to act in such a way.'

Mgr Medawar underlines that 'in order to make our position as clear as it possibly can be', the Patriarch Maximos IV had sent a bishop and a priest to visit the Orthodox Patriarchate at Damascus, before the arrival of the Patriarch Alexis in the city, who expressed the wish that the good relations which exist between the Catholic and Orthodox Patriarchates at Damascus and in the whole territory of the See of Antioch might continue and develop still further.*

* Cf. *Informations Catholiques Internationales*, 15th February 1961. The *Civiltà Cattolica* has suggested recently that the Soviet government is putting strong pressure on the Russian Orthodox Church to support its propaganda campaign against the Catholic Church.

THE NETHERLANDS

A PASTORAL LETTER OF THE HIERARCHY ABOUT THE COUNCIL

In January of this year, the Dutch hierarchy published a remarkable pastoral letter on the subject of the Ecumenical Council.¹⁰

The introduction explains that it has been issued in order to help the whole Christian people to prepare for the Council and to participate in its work, in order that it may be truly a 'mystery of salvation', an occasion for the inner renewal and reformation of the whole life of the Church.

The Bishops first devote two chapters to explaining the religious significance of the calling of a Council in our own time. The first of these, entitled 'The Kingdom of God and the Church', expounds the part which clergy and laity together have in the visible manifestation of God's Kingdom. The second, entitled 'The Faith of the Church Community and its Hierarchical Leadership', deals with the organic relationship which exists between the faith of the whole Church as such and the expression of this faith in the decisions of the Bishops when they are gathered together in a Council. The Dutch Bishops underline the fact that the personal infallibility of the Pope cannot be properly understood apart from this totality of the Church's faith: that the Pope's infallibility is inseparably bound up with that of the Bishops throughout the world, which in turn is borne by the infallible faith of the whole community of believers.

The Bishops go on to describe the Council as 'a sacred sign of the activity of the Holy Ghost in the teaching authority and in the pastoral leadership of the Church'. We must not however expect miracles from the Council, which is *at the same time* wholly the work of fallible men, and wholly the work of Christ in His Spirit; anything it achieves will be the result of the charismatic guidance of the *human* activity of believing Christians. The time is not ripe for everything, and the Church herself has not yet reached her definitive form. The Council itself will necessarily share in the imperfection of all human works, notwithstanding its infallibility.

At the end of their letter, the Dutch Bishops turn to various practical questions and problems in contemporary Church life,

¹⁰ *De Bisschoppen van Nederland over het Concilie*. N. V. Gooi en Sticht, Hilversum, 1961.

with which clergy and laity alike are faced. They recall the ecumenical background of the Council, and the hopes for Christian Unity which it arouses, and they emphasize that any fruit that may come of it will depend upon the believing faithfulness and the evangelical life of all Catholics.

AN ECUMENICAL CENTRE IN AMSTERDAM

A Catholic centre for informal ecumenical dialogue has been opened in Amsterdam under the auspices of the 'Willibrord-vereniging'. Its primary task is to promote contact between Catholic and Protestant theologians on the one hand, and educated lay people on the other. Its meetings are informal and are open to all who are interested.

The hostess of the centre is Mevr. Crielaers-Teulings, and its theological adviser Father J. van Kilsdonk, S.J., chaplain to the Catholic students in Amsterdam.¹¹

STUDY-DAYS OF THE 'APOSTOLATE OF REUNION'

The annual study-days of the important Dutch Catholic organization, 'Apostolaat der Hereniging' (Apostolate of Reunion), which has for many years worked effectually to stimulate interest in the Eastern Churches, were held this year at Nijmegen, beginning on the 18th January. The theme which was chosen was 'The Spirituality of the Christian East'.

The President of the Association, Father J. G. A. M. Remmers (who has recently been appointed a consultor of the Preparatory Commission for the Oriental Church for the forthcoming Ecumenical Council), said in his opening address that the Church had been impoverished as a result both of the so-called 'Eastern Schism' and of the Reformation, in the sense that as a consequence of these events she had become too narrowly Latin and Western. It was remarkable, he said, that periods of religious renewal in the West had been times when contact had been able to be reopened with the Christian East. And now in our own time the Pope had made it clear that the primary purpose of the Council was to make it possible for us to come together in fellowship with our non-Catholic fellow-Christians by means of a deep renewal of the Church's own life.

¹¹ Cf. *De Tijd-Maasbode*, 6th January 1961.

Other speakers were Father J. P. M. van der Ploeg, O.P., on the Spirituality of Syrian Monasticism; Father Zacharias Anthonisse, O.F.M., on Russian Piety; and Professor F. J. de Waele, on the Spirituality of the Monasteries of Mount Athos.¹²

FRANCE

CATHOLIC BISHOPS AND PROTESTANT PASTORS MEET AND DISCUSS EVANGELISM

From the 26th–28th September 1960, a group of Catholic Bishops and Protestant pastors of various denominations met together at the Community of Taizé for a discussion on questions of evangelisation and Christian witness. It was the first time since the Reformation that such a meeting had taken place.

In a joint communiqué which was issued after the meeting, the participants expressed their joy and thankfulness that such a gathering, which they considered to be in itself a significant occurrence, had been possible.

AUSTRIA

HIERARCHY ESTABLISHES SCHOLARSHIP FUND FOR ORTHODOX STUDENTS

The Catholic Hierarchy of Austria has established a fund to enable Greek Orthodox graduate students to study theology in Vienna. An announcement says that the purpose of this initiative is to help to create a situation in which objective discussions between theologians of the two Churches will be possible.

There are six Orthodox theologians from Greece and Jugoslavia at present studying in Vienna.

LATIN AMERICA

BETTER PROTESTANT-CATHOLIC RELATIONS IN COLUMBIA

At a recent meeting at Cali, in Columbia, Catholic and Protestant clergy met together for a series of readings, which were attended, it is reported, by some 9,000 people. The object of the gathering was by a common effort to arrive at better mutual

¹² Ibid., 19th January 1961.

understanding between the different confessions. After the readings were finished, priests and pastors came together for a round-table conference to discuss the existing difficulties between the confessions in their country. It is intended that these conferences will be continued.

Dr Stewart W. Herman, director of the Lutheran World Federation's Committee on Latin America, has commented that 'a few years ago, such a meeting would have been not only impossible, but inconceivable'. He says that Lutherans in Latin America 'have as much freedom as they can desire for their work', and that this 'change in climate' is particularly evident in Columbia.

The number of baptised Protestants in Columbia has increased at a rate of 16 per cent a year during the last seven years, according to a recent census made by the Evangelical Confederation of Columbia.¹³

SCANDINAVIA

THE LUTHERANS AND THE COUNCIL

Professor K. E. Skydsgaard of Copenhagen, Director of the Inter-Confessional Research Programme of the Lutheran World Federation, has paid two visits to Rome within the last year to develop contact with Catholic theologians who are preparing for the Second Vatican Council.

He is to be the editor of a book of articles contributed by Continental and American Lutheran theologians about the Council and its significance for Church Unity from the point of view of the Lutheran Reformation, which is to be published this year.¹³

THE WEEK OF PRAYER FOR CHRISTIAN UNITY

The 'Week of Prayer for Christian Unity', from 18th-25th January, together with the simultaneous 'Octave' (which is followed more generally by the majority of Catholics in English-speaking countries) has been more widely observed this year than ever before.

The leaflet published by the World Council of Churches in this connection has as its theme the text 'I am the Light of the

¹³ E.P.S., 24th February 1961.

World' (John viii, 12), in keeping with the theme of the World Council's Third Assembly, which is to be held at New Delhi this year.

The same theme was chosen by the Catholic centre at Lyon in France, and from these two centres alone more than a million leaflets in over a dozen languages were sent out.

In many countries, special lectures and sermons, and joint meetings for contact and prayer were held.

There will be many who will agree with the sentiments of Dr Keith R. Bridston, Secretary of the Faith and Order Commission of the World Council of Churches, expressed in a letter to the World Council's 178 member Churches :

'We must struggle with the hard realities of the "irreconcilable differences" in faith and order between the Churches', he writes. 'If that dogmatic realism and integrity are not present in our ecumenical prayer, it soon becomes weak and insipid sentimentalism which is neither tasty nor strengthening. Nevertheless, paradoxically, even prayer with different purposes, with different dogmatic presuppositions, is common prayer. Whatever its particular intentions, all true prayer for unity is common because it is offered to One Lord, and, however different our understandings of unity may be, "the Spirit helps us in our weakness; for we do not know how to pray as we ought, but the Spirit himself intercedes for us with sighs too deep for words".' (Romans viii, 26.)

THE WORLD COUNCIL OF CHURCHES

PREPARATIONS FOR THE WORLD COUNCIL'S THIRD ASSEMBLY AT NEW DELHI

The following statement was put out by the World Council of Churches on the first of January, 1961 :

'An intensive effort to bring the quest for Christian Unity home to local congregations around the world will get under way soon.

The occasion is the publication of the World Council of Churches' preparatory study booklet for the Third Assembly to be held in New Delhi, India, 18th November to 6th December 1961.

During the next year the 76-page booklet, which is liberally illustrated with photographs of the activities of the World Council and its member churches, will be studied by tens of thousands of Christians belonging to the Council's 178 member Churches in more than fifty countries.

In small village churches in Asia and Africa, in big city congregations in Berlin and Chicago, men and women will come together to study and discuss the Assembly theme, 'Jesus Christ, the Light of the World'.

The booklet is designed to enlist the participation of the local church in the Assembly. An initial printing of nearly half a million copies in French, English and German will be followed by other language editions for Spanish-speaking, Scandinavian, Asian and African countries. The total run may reach one million copies.

In the Preface Dr W. A. Visser 't Hooft, General Secretary of the World Council of Churches, explains that the Vigyan Bhavan Hall in New Delhi, where the Assembly will be held, cannot possibly accommodate the hundreds of thousands of members of Churches to whom the brochure will go 'in all parts of the world, and in very many languages. But we need your spiritual presence, your personal participation in this event.'

The Churches meeting in New Delhi, through their chosen delegates, Dr Visser 't Hooft says, have their "relevance in the local congregation, in the common worship, and the working and living together of individual Christian men and women". Christians often ask "how they can play their part in this new ecumenical movement of our time. Here is one opportunity."

The booklet includes a treatment of the main theme of the Assembly, along with eight Bible studies, and a section on the World Council called 'The Local Task in a Total Vision'. There is also a section on suggested ways of using the booklet.

Many denominations are planning to send copies to all their ministers. Single copies are US \$0.50, 3s. 0d., DM 2.-, Fr. Sw. 2.-. Sample copies and information on discount prices for quantity orders are available from : Publications Office, World Council of Churches, 17 route de Malagnou, Geneva, Switzerland.¹⁴

¹⁴ E.P.S., 2nd December 1960.

World' (John viii, 12), in keeping with the theme of the World Council's Third Assembly, which is to be held at New Delhi this year.

The same theme was chosen by the Catholic centre at Lyon in France, and from these two centres alone more than a million leaflets in over a dozen languages were sent out.

In many countries, special lectures and sermons, and joint meetings for contact and prayer were held.

There will be many who will agree with the sentiments of Dr Keith R. Bridston, Secretary of the Faith and Order Commission of the World Council of Churches, expressed in a letter to the World Council's 178 member Churches :

'We must struggle with the hard realities of the "irreconcilable differences" in faith and order between the Churches', he writes. 'If that dogmatic realism and integrity are not present in our ecumenical prayer, it soon becomes weak and insipid sentimentalism which is neither tasty nor strengthening. Nevertheless, paradoxically, even prayer with different purposes, with different dogmatic presuppositions, is common prayer. Whatever its particular intentions, all true prayer for unity is common because it is offered to One Lord, and, however different our understandings of unity may be, "the Spirit helps us in our weakness ; for we do not know how to pray as we ought, but the Spirit himself intercedes for us with sighs too deep for words".' (Romans viii, 26.)

THE WORLD COUNCIL OF CHURCHES

PREPARATIONS FOR THE WORLD COUNCIL'S THIRD ASSEMBLY AT NEW DELHI

The following statement was put out by the World Council of Churches on the first of January, 1961 :

'An intensive effort to bring the quest for Christian Unity home to local congregations around the world will get under way soon.

The occasion is the publication of the World Council of Churches' preparatory study booklet for the Third Assembly to be held in New Delhi, India, 18th November to 6th December 1961.

During the next year the 76-page booklet, which is liberally illustrated with photographs of the activities of the World Council and its member churches, will be studied by tens of thousands of Christians belonging to the Council's 178 member Churches in more than fifty countries.

In small village churches in Asia and Africa, in big city congregations in Berlin and Chicago, men and women will come together to study and discuss the Assembly theme, 'Jesus Christ, the Light of the World'.

The booklet is designed to enlist the participation of the local church in the Assembly. An initial printing of nearly half a million copies in French, English and German will be followed by other language editions for Spanish-speaking, Scandinavian, Asian and African countries. The total run may reach one million copies.

In the Preface Dr W. A. Visser 't Hooft, General Secretary of the World Council of Churches, explains that the Vigyan Bhavan Hall in New Delhi, where the Assembly will be held, cannot possibly accommodate the hundreds of thousands of members of Churches to whom the brochure will go 'in all parts of the world, and in very many languages. But we need your spiritual presence, your personal participation in this event.'

The Churches meeting in New Delhi, through their chosen delegates, Dr Visser 't Hooft says, have their "relevance in the local congregation, in the common worship, and the working and living together of individual Christian men and women". Christians often ask "how they can play their part in this new ecumenical movement of our time. Here is one opportunity."

The booklet includes a treatment of the main theme of the Assembly, along with eight Bible studies, and a section on the World Council called 'The Local Task in a Total Vision'. There is also a section on suggested ways of using the booklet.

Many denominations are planning to send copies to all their ministers. Single copies are US \$0.50, 3s. 0d., DM 2.-, Fr. Sw. 2.-. Sample copies and information on discount prices for quantity orders are available from: Publications Office, World Council of Churches, 17 route de Malagnou, Geneva, Switzerland.¹⁴

¹⁴ E.P.S., 2nd December 1960.

DOCUMENTATION

THIS section does not pretend to completeness, and in particular we shall not attempt to give a regular and exhaustive list of the contents of the main Catholic and non-Catholic ecumenical reviews such as *Unitas*, *Irénikon*, *Istina*, *Vers l'Unité Chrétienne*, *Una Sancta*, *The Ecumenical Review*, *Verbum Caro*, *Sobornost*, etc.

We shall however from time to time draw attention to individual items of special interest, both in these and in other publications, so that our readers may have an idea of the volume and the importance of ecumenical reflection and dialogue which is going on in different confessions and parts of the world.

THE EASTERN CHURCHES—CANON LAW

S.E. Pierre-Kamal Medawar: *De la Sauvegarde des Droits de l'Eglise orientale*. Damascus, Syria, June, 1959.

This short brochure is a dignified, not to say moving statement of position in regard to the Codification of Oriental Canon Law, 'De Personis', promulgated in the *Motu proprio* of Pope Pius XII 'Cleri Sanctitati' of the 2nd June, 1957, which entered into force on the 25th March 1958.

The Archbishop gives a summary of the history of the Patriarchal institution in the East, and then, after expressing the gratitude of the Oriental Church to the Holy See for the many positive achievements of the Codification, goes on to examine the points which, as is well known, have caused grave misgivings among a significant part at least of the Oriental Catholic hierarchy.

We should in other circumstances have wished to translate this document in full, in view of its great interest and importance. The substance of the issues involved can be gathered from the Conference of His Beatitude the Patriarch of Antioch which is summarised elsewhere in this issue. However, in view of the fact that the whole matter has been submitted by the Melchite hierarchy for the personal consideration of Pope John XXIII, it may in a sense be considered as *sub judice*, so that to translate the document as it stands, two years after its first appearance, might be misleading. The Pope has already given abundant proof of his understanding of the Eastern Churches and of his respect for their traditions and privileges; and we may take comfort from the comment appended above his signature to the reply of the Bishops

of Greece and of the Middle East in preparation for the Council :
'Attentissime visum'.¹

A THOUSAND YEARS OF MONASTIC LIFE ON MOUNT ATHOS

The following announcement has been sent out by the monastery of Chevetogne to Benedictine communities throughout the world :

For the Oriental Church, 1963 will see the thousandth anniversary of the foundation, by St Athanasius the Athonite, of the Great Lavra, the monastery which provided the pattern for so many subsequent monastic establishments and contributed so largely to the fame the Holy Mountain was to enjoy in the following centuries.

This event must not be ignored in the West, all the more because it occurred at a time when the unity of the Christian world had not yet been broken. As has been rightly said, 'Saint Athanasius the Athonite lived at a time when the Eastern and Western Churches had not yet been separated by the painful schism consummated some fifty years after his death, so it can be said that this great and holy monk was one of the glories of the one, holy and undivided Church, and that Catholics and Orthodox may therefore without the slightest hesitation unite as real brethren to pay a tribute of veneration and gratitude to this admirable patriarch of the Holy Mountain' (D. A. van Ruijven, *Irénikon*, 1958, p. 157).

For the Benedictine Order it goes without saying that this anniversary deserves to be fittingly commemorated. We all know the interest taken nowadays in the problems of Christian unity, and how the attention of the Catholic world has been fired since the Holy Father Pope John XXIII emphasized the relation that must exist between the coming Council of the Catholic Church and the restoration of the unity of the Lord's one Fold.

Met together to elect their new Abbot Primate, the Right Reverend Dom Benno Gut, the abbots of the Benedictine Order did not fail to express their desire to see the different monasteries intensify their work for the cause of Christian unity, and, to that end, a working Committee was set up with its centre at Chevetogne and its secretariate at the Pontifical Greek College in Rome.

This seems to be an opportune moment to suggest to the entire Benedictine Order a collective publication that would

¹ A photograph of this signature has been published by *Informations Catholiques Internationales*, No. 135, 1st January 1961.

magnify the personality of Athanasius the Athonite and would, at the same time, be most favourably received by the separated Christian Churches of the East. The following brief extract will show the interest of such an undertaking for the Benedictine tradition: 'The fragments of St Benedict's Rule inserted by St Athanasius in his Hypotyposis are, in any case, the proof of a spiritual exchange between Benedictine and Athonite monachism. Over and above the interest—small enough, it is true—that they may have for the history of the text of the Rule, Athanasius' borrowing stands as the symbol of that community of idea that linked Western monachism in its beginnings to the East. The historians of St Benedict and the commentators of the Rule are perhaps not altogether right in opposing, in a radical way, as they often do, the Legislator of Monte Cassino and the great founders of Oriental monachism (. . .). It is striking to see that the Rule could be used by Orientals and that, in this way, St Benedict was able to repay to Greek monachism something of what he had borrowed from it; and these mutual exchanges must remain as a pledge of union between monks, who, in vastly differing parts of the world, and in spite of a painful separation, are the heirs of this ideal, one in its principle' (D. J. Leroy, 'S. Athanase l'Athonite et la Règle de S. Benoît', *Revue d'Ascétique et de Mystique*, 29, 1953, pp. 108-22).

Furthermore, at the time of the first full flowering of the religious life on Mount Athos, a number of monastic reforms took place in the West, in the collateral branches of the Benedictine Order. It would be interesting to retrace their history and see if there is not some connection between their origins and the establishment of Athonite monachism. Finally, let us not forget that, for some two centuries, there was on the Holy Mountain, a monastery of Benedictine monks where, as the ancient chronicles put it, monks 'lived the monastic life regularly and conscientiously according to the Rule and the Institutions of St Benedict, whose life is described in the book of the Dialogues'. (On this monastery, cf. A. Pertusi, *Nuovi documenti sui benedettini amalfitani dell'Athos*, *Aevum*, September-October, 1953.)

These remarks show sufficiently that such a publication, in addition to enhancing the contribution made by the monastic Order to the cause of Christian unity, could also bring to light serious work in the sphere of historical scholarship.

Certain random suggestions, which would seem particularly appropriate to the spiritual value of this millenary, may not be out of place :

- (a) The introduction of the feast of St Athanasius into the Benedictine calendar ;
- (b) A volume of studies devoted to Oriental monachism in the Middle Ages and its relations with Benedictine monachism, Institutions and Spirituality ;
- (c) A Congress of Monastic Studies under the auspices of the Monastic Institute of Sant' Anselmo ;
- (d) A monastic pilgrimage to Athos.

In this homage to St Athanasius the Athonite all the monks of the West and not only the Benedictines, ought to have their part.

In conclusion, we invite the monasteries that publish reviews to gather all the information possible and pass it on to their readers.

We can already recommend a magnificently illustrated book in German recently published in view of the Athonite jubilee by a monk of Maria-Laach : D. C. Dahm, 'Athos, Berg der Verk-lärung', Offenburg, Burda Verlag, DM 29 (DM 35 with a gramophone record). This work is to come out later in French, English and Greek editions.

* * * *

The Right Reverend the Abbot Primate of the Benedictine Order has given his support to this proposal as follows :

'This suggestion put forward by the Information Centre on Ecumenical Questions at Chevetogne that the Benedictine Monasteries be reminded of the coming celebrations in connection with the Thousandth anniversary of the monastic life on Mount Athos and be encouraged to take an interest and a share in these celebrations, seems to me most timely. On many counts, our common history and monastic traditions, the longing to re-knit our former unity, the Benedictine Order has, I think, a very special call to do something in this respect. I shall be most grateful to all those who answer this invitation.'

The Orthodox Patriarch of Constantinople, on the other hand, to whom the Editor of *Irénikon* submitted the proposal, answered in the following terms :

'We have received with joy and read at a meeting of our Holy and Sacred Synod, the letter of your dear Reverence dated the

11th December 1959, enclosing a copy of the proposal put forward by the Benedictine Order in connection with the solemn celebration in 1963 of the thousandth anniversary of the foundation of the Patriarchal and Stavropegial monastery of the Great Lavra on the Holy Mountain, and the sharing in this celebration by the Benedictine Order and the other monastic Orders of the West.

'In reply, we express our especial joy at the praiseworthy effort undertaken by your excellent Review to extol in the West the significance of the past thousand years, and at the decision made by the venerable Benedictine Order to promote in all the monasteries of the Order a movement in favour of ecumenical and unionist questions. We inform your Reverence that as soon as the programme of the celebrations has been finally drawn up, your Order will be informed of the manner whereby it may have its share in the celebrations.'

CHEVETOGNE, 30th July 1960.

REVIEWS AND JOURNALS

Informations Catholiques Internationales (163, Boulevard Malesherbes, Paris 17e.) 29NF per year.

This admirable French fortnightly publication has in January 1961 given us two numbers of outstanding ecumenical interest. That of 1st January (No. 135), is a special number devoted to the Ecumenical Council, giving an excellent summary of the present stage of the preparations, a complete list to date of the members and consultors of the eleven preparatory Commissions and the two Secretariats, and in addition a well-documented review of the reactions to the announcement of the Council from many quarters. Here special sections are devoted to comments and statements from the World Council, the Orthodox, Anglican and different Protestant Churches, and to those coming from within the Catholic Church itself.

The number of 15th January contains an article by the Orthodox Nicholas Koulomzine; a summary of recent statements made by H.E. Cardinal Bea, President of the Secretariat for Christian Unity; a whole page devoted to the recent journey of the Patriarch Alexis of Moscow; a special 'dossier' of twelve pages entitled 'A Month Among the Greek Orthodox'; an article by a Cistercian monk on monasticism in the Near East, chiefly among the Copts;

an interview with a Danish pastor, recently ordained priest in the Catholic Church, entitled 'The Danish Lutherans and Catholicism'; and a review of Father Le Guillou's book *Mission et Unité*. One could hardly ask more of a periodical which is normally not specifically concerned with questions of Christian Unity!

Eglise Vivante (61 Boulevard Schreurs, Louvain, Belgium. Every two months. £1 per year.)

E.C.Q. has for some years been in close contact with this well-known missionary review. The collaboration will in future be closer still, since the bibliographical Supplement to *Eglise Vivante*, which appears annually and lists all books and articles which have appeared in the preceding year in the field of ecclesiology and Christian Unity, will in future be published jointly by the two reviews, and will be available to those subscribers to *E.C.Q.* who wish to receive it on terms which will be announced shortly.

Every number of *Eglise Vivante* contains a section devoted to ecumenical questions. That of November-December 1960 was a special number entitled 'L'Eglise Orthodoxe et les Missions'; it can be obtained from the above address or from Ducketts, price 25 fr. B. or 3s. 6d.

Theology Digest (St Mary's College, Kansas, U.S.A.) \$2.25.

The number for Autumn, 1959, contains a useful article on 'The Council and the Orthodox Churches', summarizing the reactions to the announcement of the Council of a number of leading Orthodox theologians; and also a summary of Fr Leeming's article in *Unitas*, 'Principles of Catholic Ecumenism'.

Una Sancta (Kyrios-Verlag, Meitingen, Germany) is the organ of the German Catholic movement of prayer and action for Christian Unity of the same name. It continues to maintain the highest standard, and to justify the reputation of 'Una Sancta' as a pioneering movement of Catholic ecumenism. The scope of the review is indicated by the sub-title: 'Journal for inter-confessional encounter'. The number for December, 1960, contains, for example, an article by W. Richter (evangelical): 'What is the significance from an evangelical—ecumenical point of view of the announcement of the Roman Council?'; and another by F. Mahr (Catholic): 'Some theses concerning the non-theological presuppositions of Christian reunion.'

BOOK REVIEWS

St Bernard of Clairvaux. Translated by Geoffrey Webb and Adrian Walker (Mowbrays, London) 10s. 6d.

William of St Thierry: The Mirror of Faith. Translated by Geoffrey Webb and Adrian Walker. (Mowbrays, London) 6s.

Aelred de Rievaulx: Quand Jésus eut Douze Ans. Introduction and Text by Dom A. Hostie, translation into French by J. Dubois. (Sources chrétiennes, No. 60).

Adam de Persiegné: Lettres I. Introduction and translation into French by Canon Jean Bouvet. (Sources chrétiennes, No. 66). Editions du Cerf, Paris, 1960.

It is encouraging to notice the growing interest in the writings of the early Cistercian period, evidenced by the increasing number of translations available in English, and by the introduction of a new series of texts, 'Textes monastiques d'Occident', within the general framework of 'Sources chrétiennes'. For without any doubt this period just before the rise of the great scholastics has a considerable importance in the history of Western Christendom, and a particular relevance to the question of the relationship between East and West. For while we cannot but be struck by the freshness and creativity of this period in the West, we also cannot ignore the way in which it was engaged in a 'return to the sources', and its consequent fidelity to much of what is most characteristic in the theology and spirituality of the Fathers.

This is particularly true of William of St Thierry, the contemporary and intimate friend of St Bernard; a man of a retiring, quiet temperament who has been almost totally eclipsed by his more brilliant associate, but who is perhaps as a theologian and a mystic of no less importance. Largely through the work of Dom J. M. Déchanet it is becoming possible to see something of his stature, and the excellent translation of *The Mirror of Faith* will enable English readers to taste something of the particular excellence of his writing, with its insistence on the conjunction of the knowledge and the love of God.

Equally valuable, and from the same translators and the same publishing house (and representing, incidentally, a pleasing piece of Anglican/Catholic co-operation), is the translation of the *Vita Prima Bernardi*, the first part of which was the work of William himself. It is a work in which we can sense something of the sharpness and intensity of the Christian life as the saint embodied

it. The description of the first meeting of William and Bernard is justly famous: 'going into the hovel which had become a palace by his presence in it, and thinking what a wonderful person dwelt in such a despicable place, I was filled with such awe of the hut itself that I felt as if I were approaching the very altar of God'. Such was the impression of the presence of God in the person of his servant Bernard.

The two volumes in the new 'Sources chrétiennes' series both contain critical editions of the Latin text with parallel translations. The little meditation of St Aelred is already available in English translation; the letters of Adam of Perseigne, the first of two volumes, give us an example of the correspondence of a Cistercian Abbot who, like St Bernard, was not afraid to get involved in secular as well as in monastic affairs. Without being of the same general interest as the other works mentioned, it will be of importance for anyone making a serious study of the period.

A. M. ALLCHIN.

There's such Divinity doth hedge a King by N. Q. King. Pp. 34 (Nelson, 1960).

The sub-title of this lecture is 'Studies in ruler cult and the religion of sacral monarchy in some late fourth century Byzantine monuments'. The monuments are the silver missorium at Madrid portraying Theodosius I, the reliefs on the base of the obelisk in the hippodrome of Constantinople, and certain contemporary coins. Dr King shows that while there is nothing specifically Christian in the 'emperor theology' lying behind their ornamentation, unequivocally pagan elements have by now been either discarded or transformed into Christian terms. Thus the emperor instead of being the representative of the divine sun has become the vicar of Christ, the Sun of Righteousness. Dr King supports the conclusions he draws from the monuments by passages from Chrysostom and Ambrose, who both resisted the pretensions of rulers yet could use imperial imagery as illustrations of the heavenly kingdom. The lecture concludes with examples of how the iconography of the emperor influenced the way Christ was represented as a kingly figure. This carefully documented survey sheds light on the transitional period when imperial iconography, poised between its pagan past and its Christian future, tried to unite the

followers of both the old and the new religion by combining elements acceptable to both.

E. BICKERSTETH.

The Church and the Nations, Ed. Adrian Hastings (Sheed and Ward, 1959) 21s.

The sub-title of this book indicates its contents: 'A study of minority Catholicism in England, India, Norway, America, Lebanon, Australia, Wales, Japan, the Netherlands, Vietnam, Brazil, Egypt, Southern Africa and among the Lele of the Congo'. There is much to interest in the individual studies which make up this mixed bag, whether the 'minority Catholicism' is seen against a predominantly Protestant background, as part of a society which is mainly non-Christian, or as one Christian group amongst many others in a country where Christians make up about half the population (the Lebanon).

To-day, however, as the editor points out, convinced practising Catholics are in a minority in countries traditionally considered to be Catholic, and the distinction between such countries and non-Catholic ones has ceased to be fundamental. He regards it as a good thing that Catholics are being forced to rid themselves of the Constantinian and medieval 'majority mentality', and to face up to their true position—'a chosen community bearing revealed truth and the seal of the Spirit, but at the same time members of a numerically far greater society which we may hope to convince but not to control'.

In this context he raises the problem of how the Church to-day is to show herself both universal and national, how she is to preserve both authority and freedom in the present situation. He questions the way in which Catholics react to the ideologies, cultures, social and religious patterns with which they are surrounded. He asks how Catholics are to work to remake the world, while never looking forward to an integrated Christian world society, since the end will be no earthly society, but 'the new Jerusalem, sent down by God from heaven . . .'

Such questions must be raised if the Church is to 'renew her youth' in the words of Pope John. They are problems of great importance for Catholic ecumenism, and a careful consideration of them, against a background of factual information such as this collection of studies provides, can do much to help forward the ecumenical dialogue.

R.S.

From Florence to Brest (1439-1596) by Oscar Halecki. In folio, pp. 444 (Sacrum Poloniae Millenium, Rome, 1958).

This weighty volume by Oscar Halecki is no mere reflection of the present day concern with the General Council and the Church Unity Movement: as the author observes in his preface, it is the fruit of an interest which extends back more than forty years, when, as a Professor of Krakow University he delivered a series of lectures on the Unions of Florence and Brest. This work is the result of further and deeper studies by a world famous authority on this subject.

The terse and rather succinct title of the book does not really delimit the extensive field which Halecki proposes to cover. Although his avowed object is to deal with the implementation of the Florentine Union in the Great Duchy of Lithuania, he dwells at length on the earlier Councils of Lyon (1274) and of Constance (1418), showing their connection with later events among the Eastern Slaves and Poles.

The author then discusses the relations of the Roman See with Prince Danilo of Halic (1253), Prince Alexander Newski and the Princes of Suzdal and Vladimir; the growth of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and its opposition to the claims of the Muscovite Church and State; the consolidation of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania under the Jagiellons and its relationship with Poland; and the project of Jagiello and Vitold (1396) (which Halecki incorrectly calls the 'Polish Project', p. 25) for calling an Ecumenical Council on Lithuanian soil to end East-West Schism. It is unfortunate that the author's bibliography on this fascinating project is somewhat scarce.

He then traces the growth of the Principality of Moscow and its relations with the Patriarchate of Constantinople and with the heads of the Polish and Lithuanian States; the progress of the Synod of Novahradak (1514) which elected a Metropolitan for All Lithuania; the controversy over the rebaptism of the Ruthenians and the establishment of Latin Dioceses in Ruthenian territory.

After this extensive introduction the author approaches his proper subject—the history of the Council of Florence and its respective recognition and repudiation by the two politically opposed States—The Grand Duchy of Lithuania and The Principality of Moscow.

The whole work is divided into four unequal sections.

The first section concerns the Union of Florence and its aftermath among the Ruthenians which covers the period 1439 till the middle of the sixteenth century.

The second section deals with the Union of Lublin and its religious implications.

The third section traces the origins of the Union of Brest.

The fourth section concerns the Union of Brest itself.

In the first section Halecki describes the events of the Council of Florence and the part played by Isidor Metropolitan of Kiev and All Russia; the acceptance of the Union in Greece, Poland and the Grand Duchy of Lithuania; its repudiation in the Muscovite Principalities; the defeat of the Hungarian Crusade at Varna; the fall of Constantinople and its decisive influence on the Florence Union and its fortunes during the period when the Metropolitans of Kiev and successors of Isidor were living in Lithuania.

In the second section the author deals with the religious crisis in Poland and Grand Duchy of Lithuania which were similar to those confronting Western Europe in the sixteenth century. He continues the thread of his narrative with the political Union of Lublin, 1569, and its undoubted effect upon the ecclesiastical Union of Brest. We hear of the correspondence between St Pius V and the last ruler of the Jagiellonian dynasty—Sigismund Augustus; then follows a description of the Protestant Synod of Sandomierz and of the Warsaw Confederation of 1573.

The third section is concerned with the activities of the two prominent Jesuits—Possevino and Skarga—and of Jeremias II, Patriarch of Constantinople who after his deposition by the Turks played an unusual rôle in the Church affairs of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. One of his projects, which gained the support of the famous Polish statesman Zamoyski, was to transfer the seat of the Ecumenical Patriarchate from Constantinople to Kiev.

The latter part of this section deals with the Synod of the four Ruthenian Bishops who in 1590 decided to re-establish links with Rome and with the little-known mission of A. Komulovic to the Tsar Feodor on behalf of the Pope with a view to gaining his adherence to an alliance against the Turks.

The final chapter of this section, entitled 'The Year of Decision, 1594' describes the concern of the Ruthenian Bishops for giving effect to the resolution of 1590.

The fourth and largest section of Halecki's work is devoted to the Religious Union of Brest (1595, 1596).

Although there are quite a few books on this subject it is impossible to read these chapters without emotion. The Union of Brest was the greatest event in the history of Union Movements among Christians. It was initiated officially by Metropolitan Rahoza, who together with other Ruthenian Bishops signed the Act of submission to Rome at the Synod of Brest: 1595. The act was made in the official language of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. From another chapter of this section we learn of the proclamation of the Union in Rome and later in Brest, despite opposition from certain Protestant and Orthodox circles. In a final chapter entitled 'Prospects for the future', the author studies the fortunes of the Union of Brest and the views of the Papal Nuncio on the event.

The book ends with a list of MSS consulted and Index of names and places but there is no alphabetical Bibliography.

It would be useless to attempt to consider all the aspects of Halecki's great work in a few lines; one or two questions of particular interest may, however, be pin-pointed.

Halecki's book is the first which explores the obscure period between the Council of Florence and its most brilliant achievement—the Union of Brest—in a spirit of such diligence and sober judgement.

Although on a general plane may be asked whether too much importance has not been attributed to purely Polish internal problems and personalities (e.g. the part played by Olesnicki at the Council of Basel is perhaps exaggerated, cf. p. 56)—the author cannot be accused of lacking objectivity. This impartial approach is particularly illustrated by his treatment of the Polish supporters of the Council of Basel—a Council which of its nature raised obstacles to the extension of the Florentine Union in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. Halecki also discreetly exposes the Roman failure to understand the problems and mentality of the Eastern Slavs and the vacillations of the Roman Curia with regard to the rebaptism controversy. Nor does the author hesitate to reveal the unjust attitude of the Latin hierarchy towards the Ruthenian Clergy.

It does seem that Halecki overstresses the significance of political intrigue amongst the Greeks and Ruthenians. There is little doubt that affairs of Church and State frequently went hand in hand, but a work giving first recognition to the idealistic aspirations of

the seekers after Unity during the Florence and Brest Unions still remains to be written.

Halecki's able and extensive use of sources and literature, particularly in the Polish language deserves high commendation, but occasionally he is a little parsimonious in sharing these sources with his readers (cf. pp. 57-59 where he touches on the difficulties of coextensive hierarchies of different Rite—an absorbing problem which, alas, in some places still awaits a satisfactory solution).

The author is not content merely to follow pre-existing authorities: he adopts an independent approach (cf. pp. 100-01, Letter of the Ruthenian Bishops to the Pope Sixtus IV dated 1476: several identical letters appear to have been written. Halecki mentions three, but this seems a little unlikely. At all events, Halecki does not substantiate his assertion).

On some matters of fact he is at variance with Ammann (*Storia della Chiesa Russa*, Torino 1948, p. 162), f.e. the latter places the probable date of death of Metropolitan Soltan II in 1521, whereas Halecki asserts that his Metropolitan office lasted from 1505-1525 (p. 111)—once again no sources are given.

Finally Halecki's terminology deserves attention. Byelorussians and Ukrainians taken as a whole he refers to throughout as Ruthenians. Byelorussians when mentioned specifically he calls White Ruthenians (or Byelorussians) and Russians appear either as Muscovites or Great Russians. This terminology is correct and in keeping with the modern ethnological approach to the Eastern Slavs. Sometimes, however, the author departs from his canons (cf. pp. 57, 58, where Ruthenians are exclusively identified with Ukrainians).

Similarly it is gratifying to see the Grand Duchy of Lithuania distinguished historically from the ancient Kijovian State and from the rival Principality of Moscow. By Lithuania, of course, the author understands the Byelorussian and Ukrainian Grand Duchy of that name; what is to-day commonly called 'Lithuania' he refers to as Samogitia ('that Lithuanian province', p. 29; cf. ib. p. 120). Perhaps could be questioned the use of the expression 'Confederation' or 'Commonwealth' when he describes the political Status of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and Poland before the Lublin Union.

These minor flaws should not be allowed to obscure the fact that Halecki has proved himself an outstanding scholar, well acquainted with the intricate complexities of Eastern Slav affairs.

As a Christian scholar his approach is sober, fairminded and generous: always seeking an explanation for human weaknesses, he abides by the noble maxim: 'Non mirari, non indignari sed intelligere'.

✠ C. SIPOVICH, M.I.C.

The Eastern Liturgies by Irénée-Henri Dalmais, O.P. Pp. 143.

The Christian Calendar by Noële M. Denis-Boulet. Pp. 125
(Faith and Fact Books; Burns Oates, 1960) 8s. 6d.

The first of these two books is one that has been needed for a long time, a brief, expert, comparative account of the Eastern liturgies of Christian worship as they are actually celebrated to-day. Though Father Dalmais calls it 'a first introduction' to the subject, it is not strictly speaking a work for 'beginners'; but they too will profit by it if they thoroughly master the first two chapters, 'The Eastern Churches, Where, When' and 'What is a Rite?' so that they will know what, for instance, a Copt or a Chaldean, is without having to look it up every time.

Father Dalmais does not confine himself to eucharistic Liturgies, but has as well chapters on the initiation rites, the rites of penance, sickness and death, ordinations, weddings, and the Divine Office, with notes on calendars and other matters. It is this unified, comparative way of dealing with his subject that makes the book a little daunting for the uninitiated, but it is surely the most satisfactory method of treatment. The author's scholarship stands in no need of recommendation, and he has got a remarkable amount of information into a small space. (There is a slip on page 82: the *Trisagion* is not omitted from the Malabar Liturgy.) This book is warmly recommended to the readers of *E.C.Q.*

Mrs Denis-Boulet, too, tells us a great deal in *The Christian Calendar*, from primitive man and the lunar cycle down to the abolition of 'semi-doubles'. Western history and usage is the main interest, but the later East is not ignored; and in writing about the possibility of a 'fixed Easter', it is stressed that the Holy See is keenly aware of the 'danger of introducing greater divisions into Christendom' (Pope Leo XIII) by such a measure. This whole chapter is peculiarly interesting; after reading it, the present writer feels less unfavourably towards the idea of a fixed Easter than he did before. Two small points: it is hardly correct to say that the Roman Martyrology or any other is 'a

complete list of all the saints' (p. 103); and Dr A. A. McArthur's excellent *Evolution of the Christian Year* was first published in Great Britain, by the S.C.M. Press (p. 125). A.B.C.

Byzantine Paintings and Icons in Yugoslavia. Text by Oto Bihalji-Merin. Photographs by Toso Dubac, Dusan Stanimirovic and others. Notes on the plates by Svetislav Mandic (Thames and Hudson, 1960) 42s.

This magnificent picture book of Yugoslav painting, at a most reasonable price for what it contains, was printed and bound in Germany and was originally published by the Hanns Verlag of Munich. The text, which has presumably gone through two translations, seems to have lost all precise meaning on the way. It is in fact only ten pages to eighty-one plates and a cover illustration, eighteen of them in colour. It is indeed difficult to know for whom this kind of text is intended. It gives too little key to the relation of this art to its more familiar neighbours, and to the main developments in Yugoslavia itself from the eleventh to the fourteenth century to help the general reader. On the other hand it leaves anyone who already knows something of the work of Okunev, etc., if only through Muratof, Talbot Rice, Dielh and other Western writers, tantalised to know what further study has been done on the spot since the war, when obviously much work of restoration and study has been going on.

We had two opportunities some years ago in London of gaining an idea of Serbian wall painting through exhibitions arranged at the Victoria and Albert Museum and at Burlington House (this latter in January and February 1944). They consisted of large photographs and coloured copies. These large-scale copies could give one an idea of the daring colour contrasts that seem characteristic of one part of Serbian wall painting in a way that no small reproduction can do. But this book is beautifully produced, the colour is mostly very good, and as much size as possible has been given to everything. One gets fine heads, and individual figures and groups: angels of angelic splendour and worshipfulness, idyllic shepherds, princes, apostles, mourners, astonished donkeys, and delightfully domestic attendants. There is much beauty of line, colour, and feeling, but there is no attempt to indicate the ensemble, the place of these paintings in the whole decorative scheme of the church, except in the case of Decani

monastery. But one can't have everything. Many of these reproductions are a revelation. The whole book will tempt anyone who loves Byzantine art to buy it.

E. J. B. FRY.

The Secret Books of the Egyptian Gnostics by Jean Doresse
Pp. 445 (Hollis and Carter, 1960).

The sub-title of this volume is 'An Introduction to the Gnostic Coptic Manuscripts discovered at Chenoboskion', and its publishers are undoubtedly to be congratulated on making this standard French work on the subject available in English.

The book contains an English translation and a critical evaluation of the *Gospel According to Thomas*, and includes a general account of Gnosticism, and of the principal gnostic texts which were known before the recent discoveries, followed by an account of the discovery of the Chenoboskion manuscripts and an evaluation of them. The work has been fully revised and augmented by the author for the English edition, and there is an excellent Index.

These texts, which were found in the Egyptian desert just after the war, can already be seen to represent one of the most significant finds for our knowledge of early Christianity and even of the New Testament itself which have occurred in recent years. Comparing them to the Dead Sea Scrolls, the author says: 'the texts discovered are indeed more numerous, far more revealing and perhaps also of greater historic consequence than those from the Judean desert', and adds that it is not impossible that there is some connection between the two religious movements.

The English translation is unfortunately ungainly, almost unbearably so to anyone who knows French well enough to be tempted to keep guessing at the original.

Emperor Michael Palaeologus and the West by Deno John Geanakoplos. Pp. 434 (Harvard University Press and O.U.P., 1959). \$7.50.

Professor Geanakoplos' comprehensive and minutely documented study is likely to prove a valuable source of information for historians of the period, and in any case provides much food for thought in the field of the history of the relations between 'the Greek East and the Latin West'.

The scope of the book may be summed up in the author's own words: 'This book examines the relations between Greeks and Latins, Eastern and Western Christendom, during the reign of the Byzantine Emperor Michael VIII Palaeologus (1258-82). The investigation focuses on the career of the Emperor from the years immediately preceding his recovery of Constantinople from the Latins in 1261 to the climax of his struggle against the West in the celebrated Sicilian Vespers of 1282. Virtually every facet of Byzantine-Western relations in the later Middle Ages is reflected in Michael's reign, for, as will be seen, restoration of Greek rule after a half-century of alien occupation did not arrest the penetration of Latin influence within the Empire. And, externally, it excited the hostility of an aggressive West, eager to reassert its authority in Byzantium. Michael was therefore faced with a succession of diverse problems demanding almost immediate solution at his hands. It was his ability to cope with these difficulties, when failure would have resulted not only in Western political domination, but, possibly, even in realization of the basic Byzantine fear—Latinization of the Greek people—that marks his reign as crucial for the subsequent history of East and West.'

The author's careful research throws much light on the deep, 'non-theological' reasons for the failure of the various attempts at union between East and West during the later medieval period, and specifically at the Councils of Lyon and Florence. The importance in this connection, which has been already underlined by other writers, of the tragic course taken by the Fourth Crusade, is amply borne out. 'It was the notorious assault on Constantinople by the Western armies of the Fourth Crusade, with the ruthless sack of the capital, the carving up of Byzantine territories, and the enforced conversion of the Greek population to the Roman faith, that thereafter rendered impossible any genuine Greco-Latin *rapprochement*' (p. 13).

Another theme which runs through the book is that of the subordination of questions of Church unity to motives of political and diplomatic expediency. Later, the driving force behind negotiations was to be the need for East and West to unite against the Turk; here, it is the Latin threat to Byzantium, with the Emperor's use of union as a bait to persuade the Pope to restrain the Latin princes. The Pope on his side was only too ready to play off Byzantium against Hohenstaufen and Angevin over-mightiness.

Behind all, there is the mutual distrust of Byzantine and Latin.

Greek resentment at τὴν Λατινικὴν ὁφρυν continues to-day in inter-confessional relations, and was fully justified if the judgement of a contemporary French monk is typical: he describes the Greeks as 'moulz de leur nature et paoureux avec'.

Recurring constantly, too, is the Greek dread of Latinization, on the one hand, and on the other the failure of even the more enlightened Popes really to understand or genuinely to respect the traditions and particular character of the Oriental Church in negotiations about unity. Of the former, we are told that at Constantinople 'so bitterly had the Greeks resented the enforced Latinization of their Church during the occupation that they had been accustomed to purify their altars and rebaptize their children after each performance of the Latin rite'. Evidence of the latter failure is the papal participation in the Treaties of Viterbo; and the rigid conditions demanded by the same Pope, Clement IV, as the price of unity, and substantially maintained by his successors, even though the more supple attitude of Gregory X did render possible the shortlived union of Lyon. Of interest is the historian Pachymeres' report that, before this union had been concluded, and in order to prepare the ground for it among the Byzantines, the Emperor received and sent to the Bishops and the Patriarch at Hagia Sophia 'a great number of friars, with a view to their participating with the Greek clergy in the psalms, in the entrance to the sanctuaries and the stations, in common partaking of the blessed bread called *antidoron*, and indeed in all other Greek usages except the Holy Communion (which they did not request)' (p. 267).

One would like to know more also about the Constantinople-born Franciscan John Parastron, who favoured the Greek rites, minimized the *filioque* difficulty, and worked tirelessly for union. After his death, the Emperor and the Patriarch tried to get him canonized by the Pope. The author comments that 'his tolerance and understanding of the Greek mentality thus played an important part in persuading certain of the Greek clergy that communion with Rome was not reprehensible and might even be beneficial' (p. 268).

Historians may feel inclined to question this or that judgement, and in general the handling of religious and theological questions is the least sure aspect of the book (the explanation of Οἰκονομία is surely wide of the mark ?) It remains that there is also much to be learnt from it by the judicious reader, not only in regard to the

historical theme which it treats (and for which it is likely to become a standard work), but also about the Greek Church and about the roots of the divisions which continue to keep Eastern and Western Christendom apart.

Holy Writ or Holy Church by George H. Tavard. Pp. 250 (Burns and Oates, 1959) 30s.

An essential part of any real progress towards Christian Unity must be the serious and patient study by Catholics of the Church's own theological tradition on the crucial doctrinal questions which lie at the heart of our divisions.

Fr Tavard's examination of the relationship between the authority of Scripture and that of the Church—about which a radical divergence has for centuries seemed almost to define the difference between Catholic and Protestant—is a major work of ecumenical theology, worthy to be placed beside Küng's 'Justification', and should re-open a possibility of dialogue where many must have felt there to be no further ground of discussion.

Perhaps the chief lesson of the book, apart from its objective value for the student of the history of dogmatic theology, is that it shows in yet another field that the head-on doctrinal collision of the sixteenth century came about largely because the questions were on the whole wrongly posed *on both sides*; and that the voice of the Church, groping back at the Council of Trent amidst the surrounding doctrinal chaos to the sources of her own authentic tradition, was heeded (or at any rate, understood) almost as little by Catholic theologians as by the Protestants.

Another general conclusion which is confirmed by Fr Tavard's work is concerning the disastrous consequences which resulted from the invasion of the field of theology, round about the fourteenth century, by the principles and methods of Canon Law. One of these consequences, incidentally, was the acceptance by Catholic theologians, including St Thomas, of the death penalty for the crime of heresy. Another, in the field covered by the present book, was the adoption by many of the notion of a wholly oral tradition as a source of doctrine quite distinct from Scripture. Fr Tavard shows this idea to be a doctrinal accretion which was non-existent in the Church prior to the fourteenth century; yet despite the Council of Trent's refusal to canonise it, how many Catholics are there not to-day who believe vaguely that it is this which separates them from the Protestants?

'The secret of re-integration, or of Christian unity, or of a theology of ecumenism (whatever name we choose to give this) may lie in opening a way back to an inclusive concept of Scripture and of the Church. Scripture cannot be the Word of God once it has been severed from the Church which is the Bride and the Body of Christ. And the Church could not be the Bride and the Body, had she not received the gift of understanding the Word. These two phases of God's visitation of man are aspects of one mystery' (p. 246).

Some may feel that the author has studied some writers in too great detail, and others insufficiently. The argument is in any case made difficult to follow in some places by an extremely cumbersome style.

In the section on the Council of Trent, the issues would have been clarified if more explicit account had been taken of the work of Frs Lennerz and Fransen, who have shown that the Fathers of that Council gave to the notions of 'faith' and conversely of 'heresy' a far wider sense than that which is understood to-day. The question of whether or not what is 'of faith' is to be found in Scripture or in Tradition or both, is affected by what we are looking for under the heading of 'doctrines of faith'. There are many things which it would be temerarious for a Catholic to reject which are not strictly speaking 'of faith' in the modern sense, but which would have been spoken of in this way at the time of Trent. Uncertainty on this point certainly hampered the discussions at the Council, and the author does not really bring this equivocation out into the open.

The last section of the book, which examines post-tridentine English theology, both Anglican and Recusant, is particularly fascinating. It shows the closeness in position of certain Recusant theologians such as Harding to their Anglican opponents, in particular Jewel and Hooker, and of both to the authentic teaching of Trent. It shows too how the extreme dualistic theology of the other Catholic tendency, represented by men such as Stapleton and Parsons and in reality quite contrary to Catholic tradition, was taken by the majority of Anglicans to be the authentic Catholic position, and indeed attributed by them to other Catholic theologians who in fact held nothing of the kind.

Approaches to Christian Unity by C. J. Dumont, O.P. Pp. 226 (Darton, Longman and Todd, 1959). 25s.

Les Voies de l'Unité Chrétienne, a collection of what may be called theological meditations on and around the theme of Christian Unity, which first appeared as editorial articles in the monthly bulletin *Vers l'Unité Chrétienne* about ten years ago, has in its French original deservedly become a classic of Catholic ecumenism. There must be many, both Catholic and non-Catholic, to whom the reading of this book has come as something like a revelation, and for whom it has been the instrument, by its spiritual depth and its theological fidelity, of a true 'ecumenical conversion'.

As Fr Henry St John says in his remarkable Introduction, Fr Dumont's book 'is well calculated to promote both knowledge and prayer. It is designed to teach us how to pray for unity and it does this by relating the theological presuppositions of our faith to an apostolate of work and prayer which is based upon and arises from the biblical and evangelical message which the Church continually proclaims to the world.'

This introduction contains a short but clear summary of the significance of the Ecumenical Movement from the Catholic point of view, and the whole book may be warmly recommended to the Catholic who has begun to take seriously the present Pope's call to the whole Church to work and to pray for unity, and who wishes to deepen his understanding of the theological and spiritual exigencies of this call. It may be recommended even more strongly—perhaps as retreat material—to the theologian or ecumenist who may think that his knowledge or attitude in this field is sufficient. All will be grateful to Fr St John and to the publishers for making an indispensable work available in English.

A List of Books in English about the Eastern Churches, compiled by Donald Attwater, with a Foreword by Leo M. McMahon. Pp. 39 (St Leo Shop, Inc., Newport, R.I., 1960) \$1.75.

This is altogether an admirable and most timely publication. The learned, suggestive and witty Foreword serves as an excellent orientation to introduce a book-list which could easily be the starting-point for an extensive course of reading, and of which one of the most valuable features is Mr Attwater's short comments on each title, adding greatly to its usefulness.

The list is up to date, and as complete as could be wished, though it is a pity that Sartory's 'The Ecumenical Movement and the Unity of the Church', of which the English translation appeared in 1959, is not included in the section on 'Divided Christendom'. Leeming's 'The Churches and the Church' would now have to be added here as well.

As a number of the titles are only available in the United States, or are only quoted in their American editions, it is much to be hoped that an English edition of this most useful work may eventually appear. In this time of preparation for the Ecumenical Council, no self-respecting Catholic library, at least, should be without it, and there will be few readers of *E.C.Q.* who will feel they can afford not to possess it.

C.J.L.N.

The Mass Through the Year. Volume II, Holy Week to the Last Sunday after Pentecost by Aemiliana Löhr. Translated by I. T. Hale. Pp. 304 (Longmans, London and The Newman Press, Westminster, 1959) cloth, 30s.

The German Edition of *Das Herrenjahr*, which appeared many years ago, has now been made available in an English translation, of which the second volume has now come out. Domna Löhr is the Abbess of the well-known Abbey of Herstelle, to which Dom Odo Casel was attached as a priest, and it his approach to the Liturgy which pervades this book. It serves as an excellent example of how the renewal which Dom Casel brought to the theology of the sacraments is far from purely scientific. It is the whole of the Liturgy which receives new light and splendour. These meditations, for instance, do not make any attempt to link all the texts of a mass together in such a way that a theme appears, which is then supposed to have inspired their selection. Domna Löhr goes far deeper into the mystery itself—without any risk of falling into sentimental or individualistic considerations. Steeped in the Bible, the Liturgy and the Fathers as she is, the book breathes a very well-balanced approach indeed. It will prove a great help to all those who wish to enter into the mind of the Church's Liturgy. The translation is well done and the book is attractively produced.

G.M. v.d.K.

BOOKS RECEIVED

University of Wisconsin Press : *The Chronicle of Henry of Livonia*, James A. Brundage.

Burns and Oates : *The Reformation*, Philip Hughes. *One Christ, One Church*, F. J. Ripley. *The English Mystical Tradition*, David Knowles. *Christopher Davenport, Friar and Diplomat*, J. B. Dockery, O.F.M.

'Faith and Fact' Books : *Christian Philosophy in the Middle Ages*, Philippe Delhay. *The Holy Spirit*, A.-M. Henry, O.P.

Mowbrays : *Eusebius of Caesarea*, D. S. Wallace-Hadrill, D.D. *Studies in the Gospel of Thomas*, R. McL. Wilson. *Love of Christ*, Lev Gillet.

Editions Fleurus : *Petite histoire du mouvement oecuménique*, G. Tavard, A.A. *Sur la dérive de Moscou*, G. Le Brun Kéris. *Communautés Protestantes*, François Biot, O.P.

Hodder and Stoughton : *The Way of the Ascetics*, Tito Colliander.

Editions de Chevetogne : *Le concile et les Conciles*. Dom Lambert Beauduin. *Nicholas Cabasilas : La Vie en Jésus-Christ*.

Editions du Cerf : *Mission et Unité*, M. J. Le Guillou, O.P. *Les Moines d'Orient, I.*, A.-J. Festugière, O.P.

Collection 'Sources Chrétiennes' : *Amédée de Lausanne, Huit homélies mariales*. *Eusèbe de Césarée, Histoire Ecclésiastique, IV*.

S.C.M. Press : *Anglican Public Worship*, Colin Dunlop. *A Decisive Hour for the Christian Mission*, Lesslie Newbigin, W. A. Visser 't Hooft, D. T. Niles. *Men of Unity*, Stephen Neill. *The Living Word*, Gustaf Wingren. *The Reunion of the Church*, Lesslie Newbigin.

Delachaux et Niestlé : *La Primauté de Pierre dans l'Eglise Orthodoxe*, N. Afanasieff, N. Koulomzine, J. Meyendorff, A. Schmemmann.

The Faith Press : *A Brief Introduction to Armenian Christian Literature*, Vardapet Karekin Sarkissian.

Verlag Herder, Wien: *Orthodoxie Heute in Rumänien und Jugoslawien*, F. Popan, C. Draskovic.

Editions du Seuil: *L'Eglise Orthodoxe hier et aujourd'hui*, Jean Meyendorff.

Darton, Longman and Todd: *Woman and Man with God*, Louis Bouyer. *The Meaning of Sacred Scripture*, Louis Bouyer. *The Church in Council*, E. I. Watkin (two editions).

Longmans, Green: *Ancient Christian Writers*, Vol. XXIX: *St Augustine on the Psalms*.

Librairie Philosophique J. Vrin, Paris: *Théologie Négative et Connaissance de Dieu chez Maître Eckhart*, Vladimir Lossky.

Imprimerie St Paul, Fribourg: *Manuel Byzantino-Greco-Slave*.

Hawthorn Books, New York: *The Ecumenical Councils*, Francis Dvornik.

UNESCO BOOK COUPONS

The attention of our French subscribers is drawn to the possibility of paying their subscriptions to the *Eastern Churches Quarterly* with Unesco Book Coupons, and thus avoiding the difficulties of currency regulations.

Unesco Book Coupons, which exist in denominations of \$1, \$3, \$10, \$30, \$100 and a 'blank' coupon, which can be filled in for amounts from 1 to 99 U.S. cents, can be bought for French francs at the official rate of exchange.

Requests for coupons should be addressed to the French distributing body, whose address is given below :

SERVICES DES BIBLIOTHÈQUES DE FRANCE,
55 RUE ST DOMINIQUE,
PARIS 7^E.

The requisite amount of coupons should be sent, together with your order, to :

THE NEWMAN BOOKSHOP
87 ST ALDATES, OXFORD

A LIST OF
BOOKS IN ENGLISH
about the
EASTERN CHURCHES

Compiled with introduction and comments by
DONALD ATTWATER

With a foreword by LEO M. McMAHON

Published by
ST LEO SHOP INC., NEWPORT, RHODE ISLAND



Price 14/6 post free, from
THE NEWMAN BOOKSHOP
87 ST ALDATES OXFORD

WORSHIP

A REVIEW DEVOTED TO THE
LITURGICAL APOSTOLATE

VERNACULAR	PARISH PARTICIPATION
SACRAMENTALS	FAMILY LIFE
DIALOGUE MASS	LAITY AND BREVIARY
MYSTICAL BODY	CHRISTIAN ART
LAY PRIESTHOOD	SOCIAL PROBLEMS

WORSHIP has been accorded the gold medal award by the
Catholic Press Association for being the best magazine in
its class.

Published monthly

One year 32s. 6d.

Duckett
140 Strand, London, W.C.2

Darton, Longman & Todd

29a Gloucester Road, London, S.W.7

Tel. KNI 7611

THE DIVINE LITURGY of the Russian Orthodox Church

by M. V. Gogol, translated by Rosemary Edmunds

6s. 6d.

THE CHURCH IN COUNCIL

by E. I. Watkin

18s. 6d. and 6s.

A critical history of the Ecumenical Councils.

ST PETER AND THE POPES

by Michael M. Winter

25s.

The Papacy in the first four centuries. Divine institution or human convenience?

WOMAN AND MAN WITH GOD

by Louis Bouyer

25s.

Mariology, including an exposition of Christian marriage with reference to liturgical texts and tradition of the Orthodox Church.

THE DOWNSIDE REVIEW

AUTUMN 1960

(Downside Abbey, Bath, England)

The present editor, who first undertook the management of the Review in 1946, will be solely responsible for its policy in the future and hopes to receive the support of his original collaborators as well as that of younger writers. His aim is to collect articles and book reviews (on all subjects of importance for religion) which are thought-provoking, scholarly and clear. This purpose will become more apparent in the course of 1961, but its full achievement will depend on the patience and the co-operation of both contributors and subscribers. The editor will be glad to receive their comments at any time.

Annual Subscription: £1 1s. 0d. or 3 dollars

Single Copies: 5s. 3d. or 90 cents, Post Free

Write to:

THE NEWMAN BOOKSHOP

87 St Aldates, Oxford

THE NEWMAN BOOKSHOP

(The Old Palace Bookshop Ltd)

87 ST ALDATES, OXFORD

The U.K. Agent for the E.C.Q.
will be pleased to supply you
with any books you require



Catalogues of new books issued
twice yearly



Good Stock of Missals, etc.



Coffee House & Lending Library

THE NEWMAN BOOKSHOP, OXFORD

SPRING

PAX

1961

THE QUARTERLY REVIEW OF THE BENEDICTINES
OF PRINKNASH

CONTENTS

- The Abbot's Letter
Brother Simeon Manners, O.S.B. *D.D.R.*
Saint Martin and the Monastic Ideal *Dom Pierre Minard, O.S.B.*
Journey to Vietnam *Carmy Greville*
A Plea for Baroque *E. I. Watkin*
Napoleon III: Centenary celebrations at Farnborough *Dom Sylvester Houédard, O.S.B.*
Community Notes
Reviews of Books

Single copy 2/6 post free. Annual subscription 10/- post free.

FROM

THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLICATIONS
PRINKNASH ABBEY GLOUCESTER

THE REVIEW

"Eglise Vivante"

GIVES THE EDUCATED CHRISTIAN A
KNOWLEDGE OF THE MISSIONARY
TEACHING OF THE CHURCH AND OF
THE PROBLEMS AND CIVILISATIONS
OF ALL MISSION LANDS

Its annual Bibliographical Supplement
records everything which is published
in regard to Ecclesiology.

Yearly, 500 pages in 6 volumes
20/- (with the Supplement 28/-)

DUCKETT

140 Strand London, W.C.2

Free specimen on demand at
the Review's address :
61 Boulevard Schreurs
LOUVAIN (Belgium)

Catholic Records Press

EXETER

ECCLESIASTICAL
SCHOLASTICAL
EDUCATIONAL
COMMERCIAL
DEVOTIONAL
LITURGICAL
MEDICAL

for all Printing
requirements

